THE REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

Vol. V. April, 1908. No. 2.

THE SEMINARY'S FUTURE IN THE LIGHT OF ITS PAST*

BY REV. T. P. BELL, D.D., ATLANTA, GA.

Dr. Mullins' request that I speak on this subject came to me between two teachings of a Sunday school lesson, to the Teachers' Meeting on Tuesday night and to a Bible class on Sunday morning. The subject of the lesson was Israel's triumph over the Philistines and Samuel's erection of the "Ebenezer."

And in that lesson I find this thought of a past and a future. For every Ebenezer stone has two faces—one towards the side whence we approach it, and one towards the side upon which we leave it—for Ebenezers are erected only by those who are moving forward. Upon the one side is *"Hitherto";* on the other, *"Henceforth."*

On this Founders' Day let us have something of an Ebenezer experience. And first, the Seminary's PAST.

Upon this I touch but lightly. Many thoughts clamor for expression; but only a few can find it. And these I group.

I. THE SEMINARY WAS PLANTED IN PRAYER.

It did not spring into existence in a day but came into being through long, earnest thought and prayer by men who knew how to pray. No one can read the story of the struggles of the men who shaped it and guided it without feeling how

*An address delivered on Founders' Day, January 11, 1908, at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

large a part prayer had in every decision made, in every step taken. And it was the kind of prayer that ascends from the hearts of men who see a great need and feel called of God to supply it. Paul saw a heathen world awaiting life; believed himself the messenger of life—and how he prayed! So of these men.

II. THE SEMINARY WAS NOURISHED WITH SACRIFICE.

None of you younger men will ever know—it matters not how much you hear or how much you read—the frightful desolation of the land in the years of the Seminary's slow and painful growth in Greenville, S. C. Nor can you dream of the sacrifices made for it.

Sacrifices by the people who supported it. I cannot tell you of these—may I just illustrate? I knew a woman reared in luxury of Carolina sea-coast plantation—later the wife of a prosperous business man—who, in a day by the fortunes of war lost all. In the years that followed she plied the needle for bread for herself and hers. Yet, in all those years there never was an appeal for the Seminary which did not elicit a part of the hard-earned money. And she was only one of many whose sacrificial gifts fed the "boys" and provided the scant salaries of the professors.

And sacrifice on the part of those who taught. You have all heard stories of these things. They are among the traditions of the Seminary; sacred traditions they are. May I give you another? Years ago I was thrown much with Dr. W. C. Lindsay, of Columbia, S. C., who told me of his early Seminary experiences. Coming out of the army, defeated, sore, he was angry with man and God, and full of infidelity. But God laid hold on him in a meeting conducted by Dr. Wm. E. Hatcher, and he was converted. At once he felt called to preach and everybody told him to go to the Seminary. And of course he was told great things of Dr. Broadus. In a few weeks after his conversion he arrived in Greenville and went to see Dr. Broadus. To his amazement he found a man dressed literally in "home-spun", and that sadly worn and somewhat frayed. He thought: If this is the way Dr. Broadus has to live, what

hope is there in the ministry for poor me? The next morning by appointment he was to meet Dr. Broadus at the old building on a side street, where were the recitation rooms. Going early and while waiting, a country man drove up on a load of wood, and they engaged in conversation; when to his further amazement he learned that this was Dr. Manly. Did you ever hear of men who laid their bodies as living sacrifices on the altar of service?

Do you see the picture? These were princes; princes, with princely stipends awaiting their word of acceptance, and princely honors. "They humbled themselves, and took upon them the form of servants"; wherefore God hath highly exalted them and given them names above the names of their fellows.

Time would fail me to tell you of the sacrifices made by the men who went to the Seminary to be taught. Seminary men were not as much sought after then as now. In some parts they were looked upon with suspicion, and in some, were almost compelled to fight their way to recognition and position.

But they won, for, planted in prayer, nourished in sacrifice, the Seminary *fruited in men.* It fruited early and has fruited all along through the years in men!

They are men who have, in no small degree, changed the current of Baptist thought and Baptist life in our Southland. And they have done it by transferring the emphasis in Baptist thought and Baptist life from the things that are non-essential to the things that are essential. Mark you, I say the *emphasis* of Baptist thought and life. May I illustrate? When I went to the Seminary in 1874, and for some years after, there was one unfailing subject of discussion among the students. And battles royal they had over it—often lasting into the "wee sma' hours" of the night. It was this: Ought Baptist preachers to invite Pedo-baptists into their pulpits? And all the depths of theological lore were searched for arguments pro and con upon this question of all importance. I noticed that when the boys left, their minds were on other and higher things.

Men who have gone forth to lead the people to a larger life and a larger endeavor. What I mean may be best set forth in an example. For years I have attended a certain association

in Georgia. I have observed with great pleasure its development year by year. This development in no little measure centered around a man—a graduate of the Seminary. At the meeting this fall a plain man, from a country church, was glorying in the progress made, and said: "But how can we help it with such a leader as Bro. Galphin?"

Now do not understand me to say that Seminary men alone have done all this work. But I do say that this is the Seminary spirit, and the men imbued with it, in association with many of like spirit who have not been in the Seminary, have fought the battle for progress; for enlargement of vision; for organization of forces, *until it is won.* The last opposition is gradually dying out in Texas and Arkansas and small portions of other states. Have you noticed how the venom of its spirit has been poured out on the Seminary? Why? Because that spirit recognized the fact that the Seminary was, and is, the exponent of the larger life.

Coming back to our Ebenezer and standing about it today, let us for a few moments withdraw our thoughts from the past, and before we try to consider the future—the "Henceforth" of the Seminary—consider a present condition. A condition which, like the Kingdom, has come "without observation". I had almost said: Without special design, and, I am tempted to believe—in part at least—without special effort to bring it into existence. Yet it is a condition which, to my mind, is very remarkable and very significant—*and of God.* It is this:

There has come to be a grouping around the Seminary of a number of the great *constructive forces of the denomination.* This is unique in the history of seminaries—so far as my observation and information go. Let me enumerate these forces:

The Foreign Mission Board has long been the ally of the Seminary; and has depended on it as its chief source of supply of men for the fields abroad. This alliance and dependence have been recognized and responded to by the Seminary in the monthly "Missionary Day", and in the place given to the study of missions in the curriculum.

Of late, the Home Mission Board as never before, has been turning its eyes hitherward for men to supply its rapidly-

developing fields in the West—where the conflict deepens and where the best men must go as leaders of the Lord's hosts. Yes, and for its evangelists—sane evangelists—safe evangelists—evangelists who know both the language and the laws of Zion. Hence this new course of lectures on Evangelism.

Even the State Boards are sending their secretaries here to select men for their mission fields. Not for their great city churches alone—nor their towns—but for the *mission* fields where foundations are being laid, and wise master-builders are needed.

And the Sunday School Board—that marvel of Southern Baptist enterprise and of far-sighted wisdom—instead of establishing its lecture courses or training schools at Nashville, has incorporated its "plant" in the Seminary. This by lecture course and School of Pedagogy—whence will come the trained Sunday School leaders in pew and pulpit.

Last, but not least, the Woman's Missionary Union has come into closest alliance by its Training School for Women—a monument to the holy sagacity of E. Y. Simmons; the wise direction of E. Y. Mullins, and the supreme consecration of some Kentucky women.

Did you note that I said *"The Constructive Forces"* of the denomination? These are they which have been engaged in building up our denomination; in organizing our forces, until we Southern Baptists have ceased to be the "guerrilla bands" facetiously described by that South Carolina wit, John G. Williams, as the herd of Texas ponies, going every one as he would, yet all moving in the same way, so vividly described by Dr. Broadus in his memorable address at Memphis; or the "gang", as we have been designated by Dr. Gambrell. We have become an army—organized, aggressive, growing every day more terrible to our enemies and our God's enemies.

Do you realize what this grouping of these forces here means?

Brethren of the faculty, it means that you are going to be kept so closely in touch with the activities of the denomination that you can never become scholarly recluses. You will have to walk down here on the earth among your fellows. If you

can keep your feet on the earth, there is not much danger of your heads being lost in the fogs of speculation.

And for the students it means that they go forth well-rounded men, equipped for work as well as for preaching; fitted to be the leaders of their people in every line of Christian endeavor and service.

And now let us turn our eyes for a little season to the future—"Henceforth."

What may we confidently expect for the Seminary, under the blessing and the leadership of God? I say blessing—such we have had. And leadership—such we all crave.

With its past and its present, the Seminary must continue to be, as it has been, THE SOUTHERN Baptist Theological Seminary. This, by virtue of its history; which has interlinked it with everything Southern Baptists hold dear, in principle and practice. By virtue of its traditions, which make its name and its teachers—past and present—household words all over our land. By virtue of the men it has sent forth, who look ever to it as their Alma Mater, dear to them by a thousand associations. By virtue of its place in the confidence and affections of the common people—a place won in the times and in the ways that try men's souls.

Other institutions may and will spring up and do splendid work. But they will not be *The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary,* in the sense that this must be, so long as there is a Southern Baptist Convention; and a Southern Baptist sentiment; and a Southern Baptist view of truth and practice.

It will continue, and increasingly so, to be the exponent of Southern Baptist thought and life. The eyes of the world will turn to it to learn how this mighty spiritual force, known as Southern Baptists, are thinking and feeling and purposing and preparing to execute.

And this will be, not alone through the men—and women, too—who go from its walls, imbued with its spirit, but through the books which are issuing and will issue from the brains and hearts of its professors. Do you know that today E. Y. Mullins is being looked upon as the greatest exponent of Baptist belief in this country? And that leaders of religious thought,

other than Baptists, are putting his "Why is Christianity True?" in the hands of their college and theological students? The books of Professor Robertson also are attracting attention, and he is preparing a Greek grammar which we believe will fill a large place. We also look forward to Dr. Sampey's commentary and hope it will not be much longer delayed.

As it seems to me, this Seminary must become—and is becoming—the Theological University of the Baptists of the South, and of the border states as well; a school so manned and equipped that from other schools will come men to complete their theological studies, to pursue original investigations in theological science, to secure that broadest culture which the age demands, in at least some of the leaders of denominational thought. *Yea.*

And, at the same time to secure such equipment for the service of the day, in practical ministry in Sunday School and mission work, as will put our denomination where it ought to be—in the lead of all the Christian denominations. The day has passed when Baptists can afford to take the initiative in great religious enterprises, and then, for want of trained men, lag behind, while others press forward and take their glory and their blessing.

After I had put in my notes some brief outline of what I have here said about a Southern Baptist Theological University, I was reading "The Life and Letters of John A. Broadus", and found there this statement: "So, as Mr. Jefferson had drawn a new American university, Mr. Broadus drew a new American seminary, which had in it adaptability and expansion, the possibility of becoming a theological university". What young John A. Broadus planned, and his young companions, Boyce and Manly, were wise enough to adopt, has developed along the lines marked out, and is today rapidly coming to realize the dreams that thrilled their hearts—to which realization they devoted their lives and their all.

If these dreams are ever fully realized there are several things which it will be necessary for the Seminary to have.

1. I was about to say "Libraries"—in the plural. And I will say it—libraries, a number of them; libraries within the one

great library. Books beyond which men will not have to search, unless they desire to let their eyes rest on the original sources. Alas that we have not a Baptist Carnegie, afraid of the disgrace of dying rich, and with a library mania—especially a theological seminary library mania

2. *Buldings.* What—more buildings? Yes. As necessary are they for a growing institution as are larger clothes for growing John or Mary. There ought to be no question as to plenty of room for all comers. My heart has been going out in loving sympathy with the men all over our Southland who, deprived of Seminary advantages—even of college advantages—are feeling the need of these and longing for even a few months here, that they may be the better fitted to meet the larger demands being made upon them by the increasing intelligence of the people, by the acquaintance of the people, as never before, with the various sociological and theological and missionary questions and problems with which newspapers and magazines and books are filled. And they would come here, but for their families—small, yet families. When will some large-hearted men and women, looking upon the apartment houses of our great cities, erect somewhere near here a great house of small apartments in which such men can live with their families free of rent?

3. And *Endowment.* This is needed for many things. I must mention only one: that the Seminary may have *men;* more men to teach. That these men, who for so long have been trying each to do two men's work, may have some respite from perpetual toil and grind, may live longer and write more books!

And men not only to teach here those who come for teaching; but those over yonder who cannot come, but who might be reached by what we have come to know as "university extension" work. There is work for almost another faculty to teach in person in institutes and other gatherings and by correspondence. For there are—and ever will be—hundreds upon hundreds of young men entering the Baptist ministry, with very limited education, who must be educated *after they are in the work!*

May I pause here to say another thing? We have entered

upon an era of the peculiar activity of laymen—activity in preaching, in conducting missions, in manning our educational institutions, in giving direction to our missionary and benevolent agencies.

It is of supreme importance that these men—some of the leaders at least—shall be trained in the true interpretation of God's Word; in the great doctrines of the Book, and in clear comprehension of our peculiar doctrines and practices. And this lest they be carried away with one-sided views of truth, or be swept into a merely sentimental fellowship with error—a fellowship that has no sound basis of truth. When the preachers were almost the only leaders, we could stop with the training of these. Now that the women are moving forward as workers—we provide for their special training. Shall we fail to do the same for these newly-awakened men, whose eyes are just getting open to their great obligations, many of whom as yet can only see men as trees, walking?

I hail with joy the recent action of Newton Seminary in establishing in connection with itself a training school for non-ministerial workers.

And—mark it—we need more men to keep up, in unimpaired excellence, that splendid dual work which this institution has always done; a work for the college graduate and *pari passu*—a work for the man who never had more than a high school training—if even that; the plain man, who comes to secure the inestimable blessings of a Seminary course in his mother tongue.

I want to lay peculiar emphasis on this point. Our Seminary—no matter what the cost in labor and in men—must never lose its interest in, nor loose its hold upon, the plain, unschooled man in the ministry. Then would it indeed cease to be "Our Seminary" to the mass of Southern Baptists. Ever and always it must have enough men in the faculty to carry on the double work; and to carry it on, not by two faculties, but by one, teaching to the scholars the Greek and the Hebrew, and English to the men who are not.

I emphasize this point in fulfillment of a promise made to Dr. Broadus the last time I saw him alive. As we sat in his

study, he turned to me and said: "Bro. Bell, you are a man of growing influence in the denomination; and I want you to make me a promise." I assured him I would promise anything within my power to do. He said in substance: I am the last of the original professors and I must soon join the others. Promise me to use all the influence you may have in holding the Seminary to the plans laid in its foundation. Do not let the Seminary become the Seminary of college men exclusively. I promised, and have ever fulfilled the promise—for these plans are wise and good and well suited to our people.

May the God of our fathers—and our God—ever guide those who direct the affairs of this institution unto the glory of His name, in the training of true ministers of Jesus Christ—workmen that need not to be ashamed. Amen!

RECENT HITTITE DISCOVERIES.

BY PROF. A. H. SAYCE, D.D., QUEEN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD, ENGLAND.

Nearly thirty years ago, on a sunny morning early in September, 1879, I was riding across the plain of Sardes with my face set towards a mountain pass known to the Turks as Karabel. The objects of my journey were certain sculptures that had been discovered in the pass. One of them had been known for some time, and it had been recognized that it represented one of the two figures described by Herodotus as existing in this very neighborhood, and in which he saw the images of the Egyptian conqueror, Sesostris. The description of Herodotus, it is true, is not exact in details, but it corresponded sufficiently with the form and position of the figure to make it clear that the latter must be one of the two referred to by him. According to the Greek historian, an inscription in Egyptian hieroglyphics ran across the shoulders of the figure; as a matter of fact, there is an inscription in hieroglyphic characters which does not, however, run across the shoulders, but is engraved between the head of the figure and the spear which is carried in its hand.

The second figure had been found not many years before my visit. While the first figure is carved upon the rock wall of the cliff, and at a little height above the path, this second figure, which is on the south side of the old road, is sculptured on an isolated boulder on a level with the road. The figure in both cases is precisely the same. It represents a warrior larger than life-size, standing in a niche, with a spear in the hand, a bow at the back and a tiara on the head; he is dressed in a tunic which reaches to the knees, and wears boots, the ends of which are turned up like the snow-shoes still worn by the mountaineers of Asia Minor.

Herodotus had stated that the hieroglyphics accompanying the first figure were Egyptian, but a photograph of it had made it evident to me that in this he was mistaken, though what the

characters actually were was more difficult to determine. Shortly before starting for Asia Minor, however, I had made a discovery which has since materially changed our conceptions of ancient oriental history and art. The discovery was the identity of the peculiar art of the Kara-bel monuments and that of certain monuments found at Boghaz Keui north of the Halys and at Ivriz in Cilicia. At Ivriz the art is accompanied by hieroglyphics which the inscriptions of Hamath and Carchemish had already led me to conclude were those of the Hittites. I therefore published letters in the London *Academy,* announcing my discovery, indicating the various monuments of Asia Minor and northern Syria which I believed to be of Hittite origin, and inferring from these the existence of a Hittite empire in the age of the nineteenth Egyptian dynasty, which had its capital at Boghaz Keui, and which must have extended from the frontiers of Palestine to the shores of the Aegean. If my conclusions were correct, the hieroglyphics at Kara-bel would, it was obvious, prove to be Hittite, that is to say, would resemble those of the Hittite inscriptions of Cilicia and Syria; and I prophesied that such would be the case. Hence one of the objects of the expedition to Asia Minor which I undertook immediately afterwards was to visit the pass of Kara-bel and there take squeezes of the inscription that had been discovered in it.

The squeezes were taken and my prophecy was verified. There could no longer be much room for doubt that in the monuments of Kara-bel we had memorials of Hittite conquest or that the peculiar art of early Asia Minor was identical with that of the Hittite remains in northern Syria. The fact was at once accepted by the leading archaeologists of Germany and France, and was not affected by discussions which subsequently arose on minor points of detail. The next thing was to decipher the hieroglyphic texts which went hand in hand with Hittite art.

At the outset I was able to settle the values of one or two Hittite characters like the ideograph of deity and the suffix of the nominative, and I also brought to light a short bilingual inscription in Hittite hieroglyphics and Assyrian cuneiform. But here further progress was stopped for many years. Our

materials were scanty, and even these scanty materials, consisting as they did of eye-copies, were exceedingly untrustworthy. It was only by degrees that the stock of inscriptions was enlarged, so that, thanks to photographs and squeezes and above all the transport of the monuments themselves to European museums, it became possible to ascertain what were the exact forms of the characters upon the stones. After twenty years of baffled endeavor, I believe that I have at last solved the mystery of the Hittite hieroglyphic texts, and in a recent number of the *Proceedings* of the Society of Biblical Archaeology will be found transliterations and approximate translations of most of them.

But as our knowledge of the ancient Hittite world advanced it became evident that the hieroglyphic signs were used, as in Egypt, only for monumental purposes. For ordinary literature the cuneiform syllabary of Babylonia was employed. The Tel el-Amarna correspondence contains a letter of the Hittite king written in the Babylonian script and language, while there are two other letters written also in cuneiform though in an unknown language—that of Arzawa—which from the first I suggested were of Hittite origin. This suggestion was confirmed when some years later fragments of tablets were discovered by M. Chantre at Boghaz Keui which were in the same language and form of cuneiform writing. Like the rest of the oriental world, the Hittites had derived their early culture from the Babylonians, and of that culture the Babylonian script was an integral part.

Ever since it became known that cuneiform tablets existed at Boghaz Keui, scholars have been looking towards the site with longing eyes and hoping that the day was not far distant when it would be possible to excavate there. That hope has now been fulfilled. Thanks to the personal efforts of the German emperor, the whole site is now being subjected to thorough exploration, and in the spring of 1906 Professor Winckler, of Berlin, made a preliminary examination of it. He was at work for only a few weeks, but the results have far exceeded expectation. The fragmentary tablets which had been picked up by previous visitors had all been found on the part of the

site known as the citadel. Professor Winckler's excavations, however, were made in another part of it called Buyuk-Kaleh. Here he disinterred no less than about twenty-five hundred tablets, some perfect, but the greater number broken, many of them being in the Babylonian or Assyrian language, though the larger portion are in the native Hittite language of the country. Many of the tablets are letters, but among them is a document of the highest importance—nothing less than the Hittite version of the famous treaty between Ramses II of Egypt and "the great king of the Hittites". Fortunately for the decipherer, the treaty is in Assyrian, the language of international diplomacy, the actual Hittite text having been engraved in hieroglyphic characters on a silver plate. As had already been suspected, the Egyptian version of the treaty turns out to have been made from the Assyrian. The newly-discovered tablet is of considerable value for the reading of Egyptian proper names, and so serves to settle the question of the transliteration of the Egyptian characters. The name of Ramses II, Miamon, for example, is written Ria-masesa, Mai-Amana, Wasmua-Ria, Satepua-Ria. My old contention that the name of the Hittite king, read Mauthenar by the Egyptologists, should be transcribed Mutallu, is verified, the name appearing on the tablet as Mutallu.

Another treaty, also in the Assyrian language, enumerates the obligations and duties of Sunassura, the king of Kizzuwadna, toward his suzerian, the Hittite monarch, and refers to the conquest of a district of northern Syria which lay on the sea and the river Samri. A portion of the spoil was handed over to "the Sun-god", as the Hittite king is termed, who, on his side, recognized the sovereignty of his "brother", the vassal king of Kizzuwadna. In another tablet a list of the Hittite states is given, which were all under the suzerainty of "the great king of the Hittites", whose capital was at Boghaz-Keui or "the city of the Hittites", as it is called. Among them was Arzauwa, the Arzawa of the Tel el-Amarna tablets, from which one of the leaders of the Hittite free-lances in southern Canaan had come; another was Carchemish on the Euphrates. The inscriptions show that the Hittite empire must have extended

from the frontiers of the Egyptian empire in Palestine to the shores of the Aegean.

The Hittite kings mentioned in the texts are those whose names were already known to us in an Egyptian text from the treaty with Ramses II. Khattu-sil II, who made the treaty, was the son of Mur-sil, the grandson of Subbi-luliuma, and the great-grandson of Khattu-sil, who is entitled "King of Kussar", from which we may perhaps infer that the Hittite empire was founded by his successor. In a fragment Subbi-luliuma is described as having been raised to the throne in consequence of a prophecy.

Among the letters is one from Mitanni or Mesopotamia, the Aram-Naharaim of Scripture; another is from Arzawa; another again from Komana. A very large number, however, came from Egypt and proved how intimate the relations between the Egyptian and the Hittite courts must have been. Almost all the letters are in the native language of the country.

While Professor Winckler has thus been excavating a Hittite library in the heart of Cappadocia, another collection of Hittite cuneiform tablets has been discovered somewhere in northern Syria. One of these has found its way into the hands of Mr. Randolph Berens, and has just been published by myself in the *Proceedings* of the Society of Biblical Archaeology. It shows that exactly the same Hittite language was spoken in both Cappadocia and Syria, the Hittite words and grammatical forms met with in the North Syrian tablet being identical with those of the Boghaz-Keui texts. It also shows that the literary language of the people was a curious anticipation of Pehlevi, since it is full of Assyrian words provided with Hittite suffixes. The tablet throws an interesting light on Hittite theology and the worship of the sacred tree, references to which I had already found in the hieroglyphic inscriptions. Hittite religion was primarily a worship of nature. The earth-goddess was the center of the cult, and the ritual gathered round the story of the growth of vegetation. With the introduction of Babylonian culture, however, the old fetiches were to a large extent replaced by the anthropomorphic deities of Babylonia, and trinities were formed consisting of god, goddess and divine

son. From the first the Sun-god had been associated with the earth-goddess, whose forms were as manifold as the Hittite states with which she was identified. At Boghaz-Keui, for instance, she was Khattu "the Hittite", the state in which the earth-goddess was, as it were, embodied, being regarded as a deity. We learn from the hieroglyphic texts that there were nine of these deified states, which together made up the confederacy of the Hittite empire. One result of this deification of the state was that the king was a high-priest as well as a king.

How largely influenced Canaan was by the Hittites during the Mosaic age we are but beginning to learn. Apart from the fact that it formed the boundary-line and battle-field between the Hittite and Egyptian empires, an improved philological knowledge of the Tel el-Amarna tablets has shown that in the age of the Eighteenth Egyptian dynasty, if not before, it was overrun by bodies of Hittite mercenaries who sold their services to the petty princes and governors of the country or received pay from the Egyptian government. From time to time one of the Hittite leaders seized a city or district for himself and transformed it into a Hittite principality. From the language of Ezek. 16:2, it would seem that this had happened at Jerusalem itself. In the south of Palestine the sons of a Hittite free-lance from Arzawa made themselves particularly conspicuous in the closing days of the Eighteenth dynasty, while, in the north, Kadesh on the lake of Homs was wrested from Egyptian hands, and although Eta-gama the Hittite leader professed to be the obedient servant of the Pharaoh, his acts belied his professions. The Khabiri, who have been identified with the Hebrews in defiance of history, turn out to have been Hittite bands who appear to have established themselves in the neighborhood of Hebron, from whence they made raids on the adjoining towns, sold their services to the highest bidder, and professed their devotion to the Egyptian court when it was convenient to do so.

Like David at a later period, the Canaanitish princes surrounded themselves with a body-guard of foreigners. So far as we can judge from the evidence of the Tel el-Amarna tablets,

a large proportion of these foreigners were Hittites from beyond the Taurus. The Book of Genesis, therefore, is justified in making Heth the leading nationality in Canaan, which is named immediately after the first-built Canaanitish city and before the other tribes and nationalities of the country. The influence which these domineering foreigners had on the beliefs and customs of Canaan must have been considerable, and as we come to know more about their theology and social life we shall doubtless find that much which we have hitherto supposed to be purely Canaanite was more or less of Hittite origin. The institution of cities of refuge, for example, as has long since been pointed out, was characteristic of Asia Minor rather than of the Semitic peoples. Archaeology is already able to indicate one important evidence of Hittite trade and influence. The painted pottery found in the pre-Israelitish strata at Lachish and Gezer has been traced by Mr. J. L. Myres to the Hittite region north of the Halys, from whence it made its way to the south of Palestine. In the ancient world, trade and military expeditions went hand in hand.

It is probable that this pottery goes back to the Abrahamic age. One of the earliest kings of the Twelfth Egyptian dynasty is stated on a stela now in the Louvre to have destroyed the Hittite settlements in southern Canaan, and so familiar must the name of Hittite have already been to the Egyptians that it is assimilated to an Egyptian word, just as in Gen. 23 it is assimilated to a Hebrew word which means "terror". The astrological tablets of the time of Khammu-rabi or Amraphel in Babylonia mention "the king of the Hittites", whose movements excited a good deal of interest at the Babylonian court. The Hittites, in fact, were already included in the "concert" of civilized powers.

The cause of this was the metalliferous wealth of Asia Minor. The gold of the Sixth Egyptian dynasty, with its percentage of silver, has been traced by the analysts to the northern part of that country, and I have recently shown in my Rhind Lectures on Archaeology that the bronze of Assyria and Palestine must have originally been brought from the same region. Indeed, the earliest specimens of bronze at present known were found

in the Troad. Lead and silver were also exported in ever-increasing quantities from the Taurus mountains, and an Assyro-Babylonian trading colony was established near Kaisariyeh in Cappadocia as far back as about 2000 B. C. Large numbers of cuneiform tablets from the site are now in the museums of Europe and America, and throw a flood of light on the social life of the place and time.

It was through colonies such as this, as well as the traders who traversed the high-roads from Asia Minor to the Euphrates, that Babylonian culture was introduced into the Hittite region. The cuneiform system of writing formed an essential part of this culture, and so made the educated Hittite classes familiar with Babylonian theology, art and law. In Asia Minor the foreign elements received a native coloring, and there thus arose a Hittite—or, as I should prefer to call it, an Asianic—school of art and religion. With the descent of Hittite traders and free-lances into the fertile plains and valleys of Syria the art and religion of the north found their way to the Semitic population of Palestine, and must have exercised there an abiding influence. The mother even of Solomon had been the wife of a Hittite.

THE LITERARY WORKS OF THOMAS PAINE.

REV. LANSING BURROWS, D.D., LL.D., NASHVILLE, TENN.

The chief literary works of Thomas Paine are his pamphlets entitled "Common Sense"; "The Crisis"; "The Rights of Man"; and "The Age of Reason." They are thus placed in the order of their composition. After more than a century since he has passed away from earth, his name is now more generally associated with his last work. It is probable that if he had not given that to the world, the popular estimate of him should have been different from what it is. One finds an interest in noting the gradual change in his religious sentiments which found in that remarkable work the full flower of his character. The man who in the early days of his literary life evinced a certain reverence for things divine as contained in the book of revealed religion, turned to the destruction of that upon which he had builded so admirably, thus denying the authenticity of that upon which he had called to establish his dogmas. His final appeal to the jury of public opinion was a denunciation of the testimony of the witness upon whom he had relied to win his case.

From this apparent fact we have an insight into the character of the man himself, as there is revealed to us that as the chameleon takes on the hue of the substance upon which it rests, this brilliant but unstable man reflected the opinions of the associates whom he admired and in whose opinions he reposed confidence. The pamphlet "Common Sense" was the first noticeable work of a man who had been in this country but little more than a year. It gave evidence of an accurate grasp of the situation as it prevailed in the American colonies. In those times it was not easy to speedily ascertain the sentiments of a people stretching as they did along the Atlantic seaboard. Interchange of thought as afforded today by multiplied newspapers was practically impossible save by diligent personal touch, and the mails were slow and uncertain. It

was a marvelous thing that the man should have obtained such information so speedily, and information that was so accurate. The main idea of "Common Sense" was not new; for the question of separation from the English crown had been frequently discussed. The immortal oration of Patrick Henry had fired the heart of the impulsive Virginians, and the more phlegmatic New Englanders had been impressed by the clear-cut logic of Samuel Adams. From the day in 1774 that Benjamin Franklin presented before the privy council in Boston the petition for the removal of obnoxious officials of the crown, so vividly described by Bancroft, the aged philosopher was devoting his marvelous influence to the cause of separation. It was to him more than to any other of the patriots that should be attributed the document of formal separation, the date of whose signing has ever been celebrated as the American Passover. So that when it is asserted that "Common Sense" was "the first argument for separation," and that "Paine did more to cause the Declaration of Independence than any other man," we are asked to pluck the laurels from the brows of a score of patriots as well as to impeach the historical accuracy of Bancroft and the annalists of the Revolutionary era.

To understand Paine is much of a problem. Here is a man of nearly forty years suddenly appearing, a stranger, amid the exciting scenes of the early years of the Revolution, wielding a pen unlike the scholarly and therefore tedious scholars of the age. It was this style that gave him audience. He set the pace of the modern paragraphist. He went to the bottom of a proposition like a surgeon lancing an abscess. While other men took sesquipedalian words and involved sentences he boldly blurted out in ten words all and more than they had said. Here is a fair representation of the style affected in those days:

"There is a class of men in the world who, when they once engage in a pursuit, or an act of any importance, will persist in working it out, rather than be supposed by relinquishing it, when they discover themselves wrong, to cast an implication on their own judgments."

When Paine wanted to say anything he said it about in this way:

"The children of Israel in their request for a king urged this plea: that he may judge us and go out before us and fight our battles but in countries where he is neither judge nor general, as in England, a man would be puzzled to know what *is* his business."

The reader did not need a collegiate education to understand things put in that way. For this incisive modern method of expression Paine is entitled to the highest credit. It is the style that makes even today, long after the need of its fervent exhortation, the series of letters known as "The Crisis" such refreshing reading. In considering "The Crisis", you shall find the same recognition of an Over-ruling Providence and quotations from the Sacred Writings wherewith to prove his points. The Tories, he fears, have been given over "to a spirit of infidelity." The origin of kingship, as given in the book of Samuel is used for all that it is worth, which is saying much. "The Crisis" was intended to strengthen the hearts of the patriots after that "Common Sense" had urged upon them the desirability of immediate separation. "These are times", he said "that try men's souls." To meet the trying issues without panic is the object of his pamphlets. The first two numbers very adroitly outline the hopeful condition of the American cause. The second and fifth, addressed to Lord Howe, were not intended for his perusal but to put in the mouths of the patriot soldiers the challenge of derision. He showed the invincibility of the methods of campaign and it is no wonder that they plucked up courage and took heart again.

Whence did he derive his inspiration? That he had a method of writing as man talks familiarly with his neighbor, face to face, and so compelling attention in undeniable. His free-lance style awakened men's attention and was brought in contrast with the dreary platitudes of the essayists under which they were accustomed to go peacefully to sleep. That was born in him and constituted his capital. All the more remarkable is it from the fact that he had been reared under the strict forms of the Society of Friends who were accustomed

to regard all mercurial dispositions and fondness for levity or satire as a temptation of the devil. But he had grown into a chronic state of rebellion against established things. He was restless under any form of restraint. He wanted to go to sea to be at liberty to do as he pleased. He entered public service and for some reason failed to maintain himself, and his first published utterance was a protest against the low salaries of men under the employ of government. He failed in a little business of his own, and would not live with his wife. Here you have a restless, impatient, nervous spirit, with mental faculties alert and quick in perception, affording all the characteristics of a stormy petrel craving excitement and unhappy in repose. He is open to any influence proceeding from characters which he admired. His education was not fundamental but it was absorbent. Given a leader whom he revered and to whom he was drawn by the novelty or popularity of opinion, and he would follow as a loyal disciple who could put into striking phrase the more labored conceptions of his master. He was thus drawn to Benjamin Franklin, at whose instance he embarked for America. He absorbed from him the views which took shape in "Common Sense." The style of Paine and Franklin were not dissimilar. Both were apothegmatical. Franklin's proverbial philosophy seems to be the basis upon which Paine formulated his political philosophy. When "Common Sense" appeared there were many to say "Dr. Franklin wrote this." Paine says himself that the opinion of its authorship was divided between Franklin and Adams. But it is easily ascertainable that a year before its publication Franklin gave Paine the materials out of which the book was constructed. The broad forecast of Franklin, the facts so difficult in those days to completely elicit, the possible dangers and difficulties to be avoided or surmounted, show the mind of the philosopher behind it all. Indeed, it was a forestalling of what Franklin himself was contemplating, but was slow in executing because of the many things which were absorbing his immediate attention. So when the remarkable letters entitled "The Crisis" were constructed Paine was living in the intimate companionship of Washington at whose camp he was

welcomed on account of his engaging conversational powers. He must have been an excellent listener or he should not have had the reputation of a distinguished conversationalist; the two go together. He had also the opportunity of absorbing the opinions of Barlow and Biddle and was in touch with the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Congressional Assembly. He knew what was going on and how men talked who were shaping the destinies of the infant people. The forceful arguments and suggestions that appeared in those letters had been the topic of conversation with the master minds of the Revolution. The detailed scheme of the permanent Congress was, according to the historian Ellis, the work of Franklin. As "Common Sense" was not an original argument for separation, but as appears upon its face an argument for its immediate execution, so "The Crisis" was the embodiment of the military situation and possibilities put into such a shape that men would be greedy to read and quick to perceive.

Now we are confronted with the strange condition that a man who was able to render such real service, exhibiting such mental alertness, and possessed of a terse, nervous, effective style of composition, and who, his posthumous admirers claim, was the leading spirit and brains of the Revolutionary era the acknowledged impersonation of the cause of human liberty, should never have been called to official or responsible station. He was to be sure, the clerk of the committee on Foreign Affairs, but that seems to be a reward for services and a means of support. He had not developed that disrespect for the sentiment of men regarding Sacred Inspiration and so his influence was not benumbed on that account. Although popularly discussing finance and statecraft he was not called upon to direct in either department. We shall never know, in all probability, why this was so, but by judging from our acquaintance with similar conditions it is not impossible to infer that he did not impress the leaders of the cause as a man upon whom reliance could be safely placed. The fathers of the republic were keen to utilize the masterful attributes of any man; but they were wary and patriotic. Instead of finding Paine called to administer affairs, we find the stormy pe-

trel unfolding his wings and scouring across seas in search of other fields of activity, exhibiting an unaccountable bitterness especially towards Washington. He declared him to be "treacherous in private friendship and a hypocrite in public life—an apostate or an imposter." He reflected upon the military career of Washington. He said that in his apothetical character there was nothing that could kindle a flame of enthusiasm, neither friendship, fame or country. He afterward held Washington responsible for his incarceration in a French prison. It ought to be easy to read between lines here. Disappointed in America he returned to England with his literary success prompting him to essay new adventures. It ought not to be questioned that he was sincere in his republican views. He was a man of one great predominating idea. But he was always getting into trouble about it.

In England he formed a friendship with the brilliant Burke. But it was not long before he became embroiled with him and the remarkable document called "The Rights of Man" appeared. This essay is the least incendiary of his writings; indeed the style is rather calm for Paine. The arguments are impressive and partake of dignity. The action of the British cabinet in repressing it and holding the author to account was not so much on account of its radical character as that the dreadful things growing to a climax in France made the lovers of orderly government nervous. It is said that Pitt admitted the force of the argument but feared that it might lead to disruption in England somewhat similar to that which was drenching its neighbor of France with blood. The struggle upward of men into a larger liberty which distinguished the 18th century required careful men as well as brainy men. Burke was what we might term a practical politician in the better sense. He apprehended that the service of government rested upon broad conceptions of political philosophy and appreciation of the unreadiness of men in his day to come into the largest possibilities of self-government. Men themselves were not ready for the ideal. All that the French had done was to prove that the people could very easily tear down. Thus his "Reflections upon the French Revolution" had for an object

the consevation of human welfare under monarchical restrictions; that it was impossible to entirely destroy the old order which had demonstrated such strength throughout Europe without destroying the fundamental ideas of accepted social order. The French Revolution established the correctness of Burke's view, for it did not reach its awful climax until after the publication of his tract. To destroy existing order is not the same as constructing an opposite social life. To men who know the results of political rashness and how carelessness regarding means for bringing about a desirable end terminates in an invitation to indescribable confusion and violence, the argument of Burke must stand approved, as the circumstances of his times required. In the enjoyment of our free institutions we cannot agree with Burke and so must applaud the vigorous paragraphs of Paine, so far as the inherent wrong of hereditary government is concerned. To us it appears undeniable that the inborn rights of men include immunity from oppressive taxation for the support of a splendid and exclusive class of rulers, the careful education of the young and the benevolent care of the virtuous aged, and the spread of a universal peace and fellowship among the peoples of the earth. The question is whether the world in 1780 was ready for ideal government. One had only to look over the English channel to find the answer.

It has been said that "The Rights of Man" swept Burke from his high position and wide influence as a statesman and ruined his political aspirations. But Windham in his diary speaks of Burke as already "decried, persecuted and proscribed" before his "Reflections" were printed. He was then by many "considered as little better than an ingenious madman". He had become unpopular in the House of Commons, even upon his own side, as resultant from the several questions of the India administration, the impeachment of Hastings and his position upon the Regency. "The speculations of all doubters first originate in some crisis of personal or mental history". Finding it to be more convenient to be out of England than in it, Paine exiles himself to France, and plunges into the midst of the political caldron. His instability and vanity ap-

pear in his willingness to accept a seat in a legislative body whose language he could neither speak nor understand. His addresses in the National Assembly were written in English and translated into French by Brissot, his friend, who was the apostle of the Girondists. Brissot was the disciple of Voltaire to whom he had dedicated his chief work. His influence upon Paine was dominant. It was this influence combined with the philosophy of Rousseau that resulted in a strange admixture in Paine's character. In his French life he exhibited an indomitable radicalism and bitterness of expression mingled with a tenderness of sentiment for the hapless victims of his own logic. He who had denounced kings as implacable enemies of mankind when brought to face an unfortunate monarch desired that he might be set free and so brought himself under suspicion.

The movement which culminated in the French Revolution was at once political, social and religious. The principle was correct for it sought to redress the ills of humanity, to destroy the outworn feudalism of the times and to accommodate society to modern needs. It appealed to a people who were persuaded that the privileges of the upper class and the existence of an established religion were the chief causes of social distress. The officials of church were in league with those of state. Avarice, simony, vulgar exclusivism were as chargeable to priests as to courtiers. The apparent hollowness of Christian profession disqualified the literary men of the Renaissance from accepting the evidences of Christianity. In this declension of religious life in England arose the school of the deists. In France the clergy had resisted the Reformation and promoted the civil wars; they had obtained a revocation of the Edict of Nantes, which had protected Protestantism, even though a million of industrious artizans were lost to France and the enforcement of the measure was affected by draggonades in which a brutal soldiery was let loose upon an innocent people. In England the Scriptures were construed into a defense of the hereditary rights of kings. The 18th century opened with a struggle for emancipation of intellect as set forth in the philosophy of Locke and for civil and reli-

gious liberty. The new philosophers found that their most potent antagonists were those who held to regal and clerical prerogative. When Paine became a prominent figure in the red days of Paris the seed had fruited. He absorbed again the opinions of men he admired loyally following their opinions. He became the willing disciple of Voltaire, exceeding him in his power of satire and outvying his master in mockery. He could say things more impressively than his masters. He who had purloined the philosophy of Franklin for his "Common Sense" and who had used his acquaintance with the plans and purposes of Washington for his "Crisis", became the latter-day pamphleteer of Bolingbroke, Voltaire, Morgan, Chubb and Volney. Is that too much to say? The sole appeal of the reconstructionists was to Reason. That was the slogan. The literary men were all infidels appealing to human reason. When the supreme triumph came, churches were stripped, the sanctity of St. Denis, the mausoleum of the dead kings, was violated, the images of Christ and the saints were trampled under foot, and a lewd woman was installed upon the high altar of Notre Dame as the impersonation of Reason.

Under these influences "The Age of Reason" was composed, in hiding for fear of proscription, where there was no access to Bible or Testament, neither of which could he procure anywhere. In his opinion he had composed a work that no believer writing at his ease in a library of church books could refute. The ready memory, the electrical absorption of the opinions of others and his wonderful facility for recasting them in popular expression remained to him. The result of his industry was the compression into a stirring pamphlet the sum of the conversations of the literary coteries, which had been drawn from the published thoughts of the writers of the half-century. His book was like the address of a mob-orator on the subject of national finance. The language is plebean wrought out in coarse Saxon. The satire of Voltaire turns into ribaldry tinctured with acrimony. He shows that he had acquired his philosophy from the English deists, his bitterness from Voltaire and his politics from that strange character, Rousseau, who, although composing a melody that, coupled with Isaac Watts'

simple hymn, has been used for a century by pious mothers in lulling their babes to slumber, sent his own children as they were born to a foundling asylum.

Is this difficult to establish? Possibly there are a few who are now familiar with the quiet author of "The Moral Philosopher". From Thomas Morgan, Paine derived his argument against the origin and authenticity of the Pentateuch. In the city of Detroit in 1894 there were arrayed a brilliant company of men, some of whom were persuaded of the historical inaccuracy of the Pentateuch and were diligent in their propaganda for the unsettling of men's minds in the divine authorship of the Bible. Against the critics a scholarly teacher arose to state in definite terms the position which they held, appealing to them to say if he had misstated their contention. When assent was given to the accuracy of his statement of their position, he produced the work of Thomas Morgan and read word for word their syllabus, and then drawing forth "The Age of Reason", showed that Paine had sent forth to the world the same statement as if it had emanated from his own mind.

Paine's argument concerning Christianity as a reflection upon the moral government of God, the unreliability of the evidence of miracles and prophecy and the worthlessness of individual inspiration, is all contained in a work by Thomas Chubb entitled "A Discourse Concerning Reason." From this source, also, he derived his argument against the immorality of the New Testament doctrine of redemption through vicarious sacarifice. Both Morgan and Chubb, in their turn, indicate a familiarity with a compilation of essays attributed principally to Charles Blount, published under the general head of "The Oracles of Reason." From these combined sources Paine obtained his views of deistical religion wherein God is declared to be worshiped neither by sacrifice nor mediation, but by being generally amiable and good natured—qualities in which Paine in his closing days was not very conspicuous.

Were it to be demanded that it must be shown that Paine was sufficiently acquainted with the compositions of the early deistical writers, there is this to be said. The principal ar-

guments of Morgan and Chubb are condensed in the posthumous work of Lord Bolingbroke which in those days was ready at hand with the literary men. In addition, the stock argument against the obligation resting upon one man to accept the revelation made to another is well wrought out, almost in its entirety, from Mathew Tyndale's "Christianity as Old as Creation." It was this book which elicited the work, still prized as a classic in our schools, known as Butler's Analogy. With that volume and the reply which Warburton made to Morgan's essays, entitled "The Divine Legation of Moses", men were abundantly familiar. The arguments were at hand and abundantly replied to, although there might have been a want of familiarity with the authors. One may trace the entire development of deistical thought of the 17th and 18th centuries through these works which are to be found in any library of pretension. Indeed, the claim may be fully justified that there is not an argument in "The Age of Reason" that had not been exploited in volumes that had been long published. It is not urged that Paine was a plagiarist, claiming the language of others as his own, but that he was an absorptionist. Paine put the old arguments in different form, interpreting them in the peculiar tongue of which he was master, but in dealing with sacred things he condescended to the language of the pothouse, the vernacular of the *sans culottes,* the ringing phrase of the jargon of La Montaigne. Men who could not wade through the dignified pages of Blount and Morgan and Chubb and who were unable to appreciate the polished sentences of Bolingbroke, caught the "Moll Tearsheet" mode of expression and were hilarious at what they imagined to be a wonderful discovery. It was only a mad scapegrace masquerading in the robes of a wise philosopher or meditative hermit, but betrayed by his own speech. It was an atom entering the lists with Omnipotence—a moment brawling at eternity!

In my advanced years I sat down to read for the first time "The Age of Reason." As I progressed I found my mind recurring to the works of wise and saintly men from whom I had derived the inspiration of my life. As difficulties of in-

terpretation presented themselves I found that I had the answers ready. The labored attack upon the authorship of the Pentateuch by Moses fell to the ground in the absence of any inspired claim that he was. The force of ridicule was broken by the fact that the author had numbered Milton among the inspired writers. The trenchant criticisms upon isolated passages, as book by book the sacred writings were reviewed, I had encountered and answered an hundred times. And when I laid down the book I found myself enquiring: "Is this all that can be urged against that which has been the foundation of all the morality and piety that have inspired the world to human effort and self-sacrifice and brought so much nearer the ideal civilization of the perfect life? Is this the best that can be done towards extinguishing the torch of faith, of robbing the soul of the inspiration of a deathless hope, of silencing the tender wooings of the Voice that spake as never man spake, of transmuting into glaring brass the sweet heavens out of which men had been taught to lift up patient hands in prayer?" If this is all that can be urged against the Book that is the comfort of millions and the silent influence which has brought in the age of which Paine dreamed, I could be only profoundly grateful because of its own declaration: "The Word of the Lord abideth forever."

THE FIGURE OF EXAGGERATED CONTRAST.

PROF. JOHN R. SAMPEY, D.D., LL.D.

Many interpreters of Scripture, through failure to recognize the figure of exaggerated contrast, have misunderstood important passages in the Word of God. In this figure of speech a speaker or writer states as absolute an antithesis which is only relative. He speaks as if he would set aside altogether one factor in the comparison. Thus Amos says: "You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities" (Amos 3:2). One might naturally infer from this that Jehovah took no interest in nations other than Israel. But the same prophet exclaims: "Are ye not as the children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel? saith Jehovah. Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir?" (Amos 9:7). Evidently Amos regarded Jehovah as God over all the earth. While bestowing special grace and kindness upon Israel, He also presided over the migrations of heathen peoples. The antithesis in 3:2 between Israel and heathen nations was only relative, and not absolute, as a literalist might have wrongly supposed.

Did Isaiah despise all the sacrifices and offerings of the Mosaic system? One might be led to think so from a careless reading of Isaiah 1:11-14: "What unto me is the multitude of your sacrifices? saith Jehovah: I have had enough of the burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand, to trample my courts? Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; new moon and sabbath, the calling of assemblies—I cannot away with iniquity and the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth; they are a burden unto me; I am weary of bearing them." This language might be interpreted as a complete rejection of the entire sacrificial system as inherently distasteful to Jehovah. If so, then Jehovah rejects the

prayers of Israel just as completely as her sacrifices and offerings. The prophet continues: "And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you; yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear; your hands are full of blood" (Isaiah 1:15). We cannot for a moment think that Isaiah meant to teach that prayer is displeasing to Jehovah. What he means to say is that observance of the Mosaic ritual is no substitute for right living. If rulers and people alike remind one of Sodom and Gomorrah in moral degeneracy, neither sacrifice nor prayer, coming from such hypocrites, can be acceptable to the holy God. What Jehovah demands is a complete reformation in morals. Let justice and charity take the place of smoking offerings and long prayers. The antithesis between sacrifice and prayer on the one hand, and a just and a charitable life on the other, seems to be absolute, though really only relative. Both sacrifice and prayer on the part of just and charitable Israelites would be acceptable to Jehovah.

In Isaiah 58:3-7 perfunctory fasting attended by selfishness is contrasted with mercy and charity in everyday life. The prophet seems to have little regard for the ceremonial law, but the contrast between fasting and charity is not as absolute as the antithesis between light and darkness; for it is only fasting attended with selfish exaction and oppression that falls under the censure of the prophet. In the same chapter (58:13, 14), he exalts the ceremonial law by making the observance of the Sabbath a condition of prosperity and blessing.

The first half of Hosea 6:6 is a good example of the figure of exaggerated contrast: "For I desire goodness, and not sacrifice." The unwary reader might conclude that Hosea here teaches the complete rejection of sacrifice. That this would be a mistake appears in the second clause of the verse, in which the antithesis is less sharply put. In the latter half of the verse Jehovah says that he desires "the knowledge of God *more than* burnt-offerings". The form of the second half of the verse leads the reader to a correct interpretation of the first half.

In Hosea 8:11-14 the prophet might seem to teach that all

sacrifices were unacceptable to Jehovah. Examine the context more closely, however, and it becomes clear that the sacrifices are offered upon forbidden altars by a people that has rejected Jehovah's precepts.

In Micah 6:6-8 spiritual religion is put in such sharp contrast with ceremonial worship that the latter seems to be wholly excluded from Jehovah's requirements. Nothing that men can give to Jehovah, whether burnt-offerings by the thousand or rivers of oil by the ten thousand, or even one's first-born son, can atone for sin and make one acceptable to Jehovah. Justice and kindness and fellowship with God are so far superior to ceremonial worship and costly gifts that the latter count practically for nothing. But it would be a mistake to infer from this magnificent description of the essence of genuine religion that Micah was wholly opposed to the temple worship of his day. He complained that the priests taught for hire, the heads of the people judged for reward, and the prophets practiced divination for money. Hence he announced that Zion should be plowed as a field and Jerusalem become heaps of rubbish (Micah 3:11, 12).

The prophet Malachi represents Jehovah as so displeased with blind and lame animals laid upon his altar that he would prefer to have the temple worship altogether abolished: "Oh that there were one among you that would shut the doors, that ye might not kindle fire on mine altar in vain! I have no pleasure in you, saith Jehovah of hosts, neither will I accept an offering at your hand." The rejection of the temple worship would seem to be absolute and final. Malachi might naturally be put with Isaiah, Micah and the other prophets, who are wrongly supposed to have opposed the sacrificial system in Israel. That this is not a true statement of the case, however, is evident from Malachi 2:1-9, in which the high calling of Levi and the covenant with him receive express recognition. Jehovah takes no pleasure in the offerings in the temple, not because he rejects sacrifices altogether, but because the people are insulting him by bringing lame and sick animals and laying them upon his altar.

One of the most interesting and important examples of the

figure of exaggerated contrast occurs in Jeremiah 7:21-23. The prophet speaks in sarcasm: "Add your burnt-offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat flesh." Becoming thoroughly excited in his moral indignation over the abuses around him, the prophet exclaims in Jehovah's name: "For I spoke not to your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices; but this thing I commanded them, saying, Hearken to my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people; and walk ye in all the ways that I command you, that it may be well with you." The antithesis between the sacrificial system on the one hand, and obedience to Jehovah on the other, is put in the most absolute form. A literalist would so understand it without further ado; and some of the most scholarly critics and commentators of recent years have tumbled headlong into the pit of literalism. They contend that Jeremiah here says that the system of sacrifice practiced in the temple, with which the prophet must have been quite familiar, was not delivered to Israel by Jehovah through Moses at the time of the Exodus, but that the requirements of Jehovah through Moses consisted simply in obedience to Jehovah's commands. As Prof. Brown, in his new commentary on Jeremiah says, "Sacrifices did not originate at Sinai, and were not there commanded." Attention to the divine voice and a life in harmony with his will was the substance of the divine requirement when Jehovah brought Israel out of Egypt.

It seems to us quite plain that Jeremiah here uses the figure of exaggerated contrast. Quiet, phlegmatic natures do not find it easy to understand the impassioned imagery of an oriental orator whose soul is on fire with indignation in the presence of aggravating abuses in religion. In order to drive his message home, the prophet overstates it, using the form of absolute antithesis instead of relative. Jeremiah's meaning is, "Jehovah did not lay emphasis on sacrifices and burnt-offerings at Sinai, but on obedience to his holy commands." To love God with all the heart and one's neighbor as oneself is the main thing in the religion of Jehovah. Obey his high and holy requirements, and do not pay so much attention to ani-

mal sacrifices, since they weigh little in comparison with obedience and spiritual fellowship with God. Jehovah did not mean that his people should devote their chief attention to a sacrificial system, but rather that they should walk in loving obedience to his moral and spiritual demands.

With the prophets, as we have seen, the figure of exaggerated contrast is not an unusual method of speech. The poets of Israel also employed it effectively. See Ps. 50:7-15, where the flesh of bulls and goats is contrasted with thanksgiving and the payment of vows. See also Ps. 51:16, 17, where burnt-offering is contrasted with a broken and a contrite heart. The psalmist apparently puts no value at all on sacrifice and burnt-offerings. It seems to us, however, that here again we have a good example of the expression of relative antithesis as if it were absolute. Verses 18 and 19 of Psalm 51 speak of Jehovah's acceptance of the sacrifices of righteousness.

The most striking example of the figure of exaggerated contrast is the language of our Lord, recorded in Luke 14:26: "If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." What can a literalist do with this passage, unless it be to butt his brains out on it?

Of course our Lord means to teach that our love for him ought to be so intense that all other love pales into hatred in comparison therewith. Jesus demands the first place in our hearts. Matthew gives substantially the thought expressed in Luke as having been spoken on an earlier occasion. As he records it, the antithesis is relative: "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me" (Matt. 10:37).

As a field preacher addressing thousands of restless hearers, our Lord projected among them many striking sayings which could not be forgotten. Some hearers might not understand at the moment, but all could remember what he said.

The Sermon on the Mount abounds in exaggerated contrast. Jesus attacks current abuses in language that can never be

forgotten. Instead of swearing by the heaven or the earth or Jerusalem or one's own head, "Swear not at all". Shall the follower of Jesus then refuse to take an oath in a court of justice? Not if he imitates the Son of man; for he took an oath before the Sanhedrin that he was the Messiah. The followers of Jesus are required to submit to wrong rather than to seek revenge. The code of Hammurabi and Moses agree in the statute, "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth". The Jewish teachers encouraged the redress of grievances, insisting that it was right to hate an enemy and take vengeance on a wrongdoer. Jesus says: "Resist not him that is evil; but whoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Jesus himself did not follow this rule literally when he was rudely smitten in the presence of the Sanhedrin, but firmly remonstrated (John 18:22, 23). Dr. Broadus, in his Commentary on Matthew, quotes with approval the remark by Dykes: "Of course, when an instance is selected to illustrate a principle, the instance is usually an extreme or next to impossible one; both because a principle is best seen when pushed to its ultimate application, and also because there is less chance of people blindly copying the example when its extravagance drives them to search for some inner meaning in it."

The great Russian novelist Tolstoi reorganizes the teaching of Jesus on the literal interpretation of the precept, "*Resist not evil*". He takes the striking precepts of our Lord in the Sermon on the Mount, and presses them down on the conscience as commands to be obeyed to the letter by those who would follow Jesus. The entrance of common sense is forbidden by the Count as an effort to explain away the Scriptures. A small group of hyperbolical sayings in one discourse are made the norm of Christian teaching and conduct. In his reaction from nihilism, the brave foe of effete ecclesiasticism and autocratic power has fallen into the slough of literalism.

A STUDY OF HOMILETICAL THEORY.

THE ORIGINS OF HOMILETICAL THEORY BEFORE A. D. 400

BY EDWIN CHARLES DARGAN, D.D., LL.D.

ARTICLE II.

If the former article has shown that homiletical theory has a scientific value of its own, it may be assumed that a study of its origin and historical development will not be devoid of worth and interest. And interest is quickened by the fact that we are not left to conjecture and inference for a clear tracing of the rise and progress of homiletical theory. Of course many details are unknown, and the inevitable penumbra of obscurity and doubt envelops even the central certainties; but on the whole we have reason to congratulate ourselves that the main principles and general outlines of our subject rest upon well known or easily discoverable facts, and we may, therefore, have a feeling of security in reaching our results rather beyond what may be cherished in regard to many similar historic researches. Our task is further simplified by the consideration that doctrinal and critical prepossessions need not disturb the serenity of our pursuit. Happy we! Our only concern is to find and tell, as well as we can, how a theory or art of preaching arose and grew.*

*NOTE.—To dispense with the multiplication of foot notes I give here the chief authorities used, quoted or referred to in the body of the article. To all I wish to make the fullest acknowledgment of indebtedness without surrendering any proper claim to personal labors and independent thought. The list follows, as nearly as practicable, the order of discussion in the article. Grote's History of Greece; Mommsen's History of Rome; Sears' History of Oratory; Jebb's Attic Orators; Davidson's Aristotle and the Ancient Educational Ideals; Bekker's Charicles; articles in the Encyclopaedia Britannica on Rhetoric and on Aristotle; Cope's Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric; Aristotle's Rhetoric, both the Bohn transalation and the far better one of Welldon, with the notes to each; Cicero's *Brutus* and *De Oratore*, the Bohn translations; Quintilian's Instititute of Oratory; Watson's translation in the Bohn Library (translations preferred for convenience; there was consultation of originals when thought necessary); article in *Revue des Deux Mondes* for March 15th, 1884, by M. Gaston Boisier on *L'Instruction Publique dans l'Empire Romain;* Hatch's Hibbert Lectures for 1888; articles in Hastings Bible Dictionary on Jewish Education by A. R. S.

In this article we are concerned with those fundamental facts and forces out of which homiletical theory came in time to be developed. Our thesis is: That before the formulation of a distinct theory of Christian discourse by Augustine, at the turn of the fourth into the fifth century, such a theory was germinating all through the patristic age, and that the formative forces of this germination were two widely different but very effective influences which came together within that epoch and have never been discarded, namely, the classical and the Biblical. So we may describe this vast originative period as deploying three great forces toward the development of homiletical theory: (1) The Classical Impulse, or the development of the Graeco-Roman rhetoric; (2) The Biblical Impulse, or the unfolding of the principles of religious discourse in the Old and New Testaments; (3) The Patristic Impulse, or the germination of a theory of preaching during the second, third and fourth Christian centuries.

THE CLASSICAL IMPULSE.

The splendid oratory of the Greek and Roman peoples during the flourishing periods of their history is too well known to need more than this passing reference. Along with the practice a theory was also developed, and the Graeco-Roman rhetoric has been a rich storehouse of principles for all subsequent times. Indeed, there has been little of real value or original thought added to the ancient treatises. What has followed has been mostly in the way of necessary development

Kennedy on Prophecy, by A. B. Davidson; in the Jewish Encyclopaedia on the appropriate subjects; Mabaum's *Judische Homiletik* (Einleit) and Dr. Phillipson's article in the Jewish Encylopaedia on Homiletics; Stalker's Preacher and his Models, and Imago Christi; G. A. Smith's Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Test.; Schurer's History of the Jewish People in the time of Christ; Edersheim's and other Lives of Christ; various commentaries, the works on early Church History; Broadus' Lectures on the History of Preaching, and on Jesus of Nazareth; Paniel's *Geschichte der Christlichen Beredsamkeit;* Rothe's *Geschichte der Predigt*; Nebe's *Zur Geschichte der Predigt;* articles by Christlieb on *Homiletik* and *Geschichte der Prestigt*, in the Herzog-Plitt (second edition) *Real-Encyclopadie;* and on *Homiletik* by Keppler in Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexicon*; works of Origen, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Ambrose and other Fathers so far as needed, usually in the translations of the Apostolic, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, but in the originals when desirable, as given in Migne's Patrology or other editions.

and of adaptation to later times, languages and conditions. The Greek theory of oratory received its most scientific and enduring expression in Aristotle's work on rhetoric. Aristotle died in 322 B. C. The Roman rhetoric found its best and completest treatment in the works of Cicero and Quintilian, the former of whom died B. C. 43, and the latter about A. D. 120, possibly earlier. The Roman rhetoric was very largely dependent on the Greek—as was the case in other departments of literature—though Quintilian's work is a far more finished and complete performance than Aristotle's. We thus see that at the time when the ancient rhetoric came in contact with the post-biblical preaching the theory of public speaking had reached a high state of development and needed only adaptation to Christian discourse. And homiletical theory, both in its origin and in its development, *is* the application of accepted principles of public speaking to the particular ends and demands of the Christian gospel. Our business now is to trace briefly the rise and perfecting of this ancient classical rhetoric up to its impact upon the even more ancient though partly parallel development of Biblical prophecy, preaching and hermeneutics.

The origin of the Greek people and their language cannot be traced, but their history and literature reveal them as a speaking people. In the Homeric poems the heroes are orators as well as warriors. Herodotus and Thucydides, as well as other historians, make record of speeches, and even report or invent them. Thucydides devotes especial attention to the noble oratory of Pericles. The drama also indicates the sway which oratory held in the popular esteem and customs. Lastly, oratory itself extended from practice into literature and theory. Published orations and treatises on the art of speaking are the latest development of Greek letters. Grote accounts for this oratorical element of Grecian culture as lying in the genius and language of the Hellenic peoples, in their love of liberty and their forms of government, in the parallel and sympathetic development among them of philosophy and art, in their popular assemblies, and especially in the nature of their law courts and systems of pleading. Jebb points out two

forces in the origin and development of technical studies of oratory: (1) The impulse given to Greek thought and culture by the dialectic philosophy of the Ionian schools; and (2) The technical rhetoric of the Sicilian teachers. Neither of these movements originated at Athens, but both found early lodgment and careful attention in the chief seat of Hellenic culture. The dialectic impulse came chiefly from Protagoras (who taught how to make the weaker cause appear the stronger), Prodicus (who taught how to distinguish synonyms), and Empedocles, the philosopher-poet of Sicily. The strictly rhetorical impulse came from Gorgias (a pupil of Empedocles), Korax, and Tisias (a pupil of Korax), all of Sicily. Grote was inclined to recognize Empedocles and Gorgias as the beginners of properly rhetorical instruction among the Greeks, but Jebb, with apparently better reason, considers Korax of Syracuse (B. C. 466) as the founder and father of Greek rhetoric, so far as that distinction may be given to any one man. At any rate it was he that published the first treatise which professed to give rules for the art of public speaking.

In B. C. 466, Thrasybulus, tyrant of Syracuse, was overthrown and a democracy established. By him and his predecessors much land had been, from time to time, confiscated and bestowed on different ones, so that on the fall of the tyrant numerous claimants for these lands arose, and there was great confusion as to titles. The causes had to be tried before the popular courts, and the claimants were required to present their arguments in person. Many were timid and unskilled in speaking. So Korax drew up a system of rules and taught the pleaders how to present their claims. Cope, in his Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric (p. 28), speaks very slightingly of this famous treatise, saying that it was occupied wholly with the argument from probability which was nothing more nor less than to make the worse appear the better reason, "in other words, to subvert truth and justice". I have never seen the treatise nor any analysis of it and cannot therefore uphold or dispute the fairness of Cope's criticism; but it seems a little onesided and severe though no doubt well founded. Tisias was a pupil of Korax and carried on the work of his master.

Gorgias, a contemporary of these and a pupil of Empedocles, came to Athens on a political errand and so captivated the Athenians by his florid style of eloquence that he was (no doubt easily!) induced to remain and become a teacher of the art of speaking. After him the orator Antiphon combined theory and practive by being both a pleader in the courts and an instructor of others. Lysias, as is well known, wrote speeches for his clients; and Isaeus, the teacher of Demosthenes, did likewise, besides giving instruction in oratory.

The method of these earliest teachers has perpetuated itself. There was study of treatises, like that of Korax, which was speedily followed by many others; there was lecture or conversational discussion with the pupils; there was critical study, under the teacher's guidance, both of the poets and orators; and there were models furnished by the teacher, and exercises submitted by the pupils. Thus, as often, are we reminded of the famous saying of Sydney Smith, that "the ancients have stolen all of our best ideas".

Greek oratory and rhetoric—practice and theory—came to their culmination in the same age; the one in Demosthenes and the other in Aristotle, both of whom died in the year 322 B. C. The immortal treatise of Aristotle was the fruit of his reflections and teachings during the years of his great career as a teacher at Athens of all the elements of knowledge current in his day. The limits of this article forbid any study of this marvelous man and his manysided and lasting influence upon thought and culture. We have here in view only his rhetorical theory. Quintilian somewhere states that Aristotle was accustomed to talk on rhetoric with his pupils as he walked, on the covered ways (*peripatoi,* hence Peripatetic) of his famous Lyceum, in the afternoons. We might infer from the wretched style and arrangement in which the famous treatise reaches us that postprandial dullness and jog-trot conversation both figure somewhat in its preparation. Perhaps it is more charitable to assume that the work was not written by Aristotle at all, but is only the conglomerate notes of his pupils—and taken in afternoon walks! At any rate some sort of apology is due to posterity for the form in which this most

interesting and valuable production has come down to us. A brief synopsis of its contents is all that can be here presented.

After preliminary definitions and explanations the three main topics treated as essential to rhetorical theory are Arguments (πίστεις), Diction (λέξις), and Order (τάξις); and it might be assumed that the treatment would adhere to this lucid and comprehensive division, but it does so only in a general way. There are three books and the outline of them is this:

Book I. The Nature of Oratory and Rhetoric. (Aristotle himself gives no such indication of his matter. This heading is inferred from the contents.) In chapters 1-3 there are introductory definitions and explanations:—The relation of logic to rhetoric is stated, the utility of rhetoric defended, and rhetoric is defined as "the faculty of considering in any subject that which will induce belief." It is the art of persuasion and therefore deals mostly with argument. Arguments are classified as (1) Technical (those which lie in the scope of rhetoric itself, *i. e.*, may be produced or discovered by the speaker); and (2) Untechnical (those which lie outside of the speaker's mind, external, legal, documentary, etc.). The Technical or Rhetorical Arguments are further explained as being derived (1) from the character of the speaker, (2) from the disposition of the hearer, and (3) from the speech itself—*i. e.*, the form its argument takes, whether (a) enthymeme (rhetorical deduction) or example (rhetorical induction). The three kinds of oratory are then distinguished: (1) Deliberative (political, legislative); (2) Epideictic (no good English equivalent; show oratory, declamatory, platform, belonging to some occasion, memorial, invective, etc., in other words "the big speech"); (3) Judicial, or Forensic (pertaining to law courts). In chapters 4-15 there follows a more detailed discussion of these, with suggestion of the topics appropriate to each. As an appendix to the treatment of judicial oratory Aristotle mentions and dismisses the untechnical arguments, such as testimony, oaths, deeds, etc.

Book II. Discussion of the Technical Arguments—πίστεις. The threefold distinction is reduced to two by merging the

first two (those relating to speaker and hearer) into one, which are called *ethical* arguments, and are treated at length in chapters 1-18. In this section (2-11) there is an acute discussion of the feelings and how they are to be reached, such as anger and placability, love and hatred, confidence and fear, benevolence, pity, etc. Varieties of character and condition (age and fortune) are also brought under penetrating review, and the way to deal with them. Then the *logical* arguments, *i. e.*, those inhering in the speech itself, are taken up and discussed in chapters 19-26. First he briefly notices the common topics (c. 19), *i. e.,* those belonging to all kinds of oratory, such as possibility, fact (past or future), and degree. Then there is a strong study of the rhetorical induction and deduction (example and enthymeme). Of the latter there is an ill-arranged enumeration of twenty-eight varieties. Then comes a discussion of fallacies and of refutation.

Book III. Diction (Style λέξις) and Order (Arrangement, τάξις).

By way of preliminary in chapter 1 the threefold division into argument, style and arrangement is noted. Then the matter of delivery and voice is taken up. The subject is dismissed in a very brief but luminous and suggestive way. Then follows a disjointed and repetitious discussion of diction or style. It is full of good things, but does not readily lend itself to brief analysis, and to enumerate all the points would take too much space. Such matters as faults of diction and construction, use of words, figures of speech, purity, dignity, rhythm, etc., are presented with great good sense and spirit. The four chief "virtues" of style are held to be: clearness, fitness, impressiveness, and beauty. Lastly and briefly, chapters 13-19, arrangement is considered. The necessary parts of a speech are only two: Proposition and Proof; but Introduction and Conclusion may be added, making four. The introduction may be derived from the speaker, the subject (or occasion), the audience, or the opponent. The Statement, or Narration varies according to the kind of oratory—Epideictic, Forensic, or Deliberative. The Proof may be either direct (arguments appropriate to the kind of oratory again) or indirect, as interrogation, reply,

ridicule. The Conclusion has one or more of four aims: (1) To incline the hearer favorably; (2) To amplify or diminish for effect; (3) To appeal to feeling; or (4) To recall the line of thought.

It is a remarkable fact that this, the most suggestive and scientific treatise on rhetoric which appeared in ancient times, and almost in any time, came not from a professional rhetorician nor from an orator, but from a great all-round philosopher who was chiefly intent on other subjects but took this in as an important element of his teaching. This goes far to explain both the merits and the glaring defects of the work. It is easy to criticise its faulty arrangement, its inadequate definition, its dry and difficult style, its vexatious obscurities, and many other details here and there. But on the whole criticism is lost in admiration when we consider the ample knowledge, the wealth of illustration, the penetrating judgment and discrimination, the broad and firm grasp of fundamental and unversal principles, the depth and acuteness of thought, and the exhaustiveness of suggestion displayed in this brief and vigorous treatise. How much Aristotle may have owed to his predecessors we may not say, but probably not much; for he commonly speaks very slightingly of other works. As it stands Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is the supreme achievement of the Hellenic mind on the subject of which it treats. Besides the *Rhetoric* Aristotle wrote a less valuable work, to which he sometimes refers—the *Topics*, or helps to invention.

In the early Roman times there was a developing native oratory, but the later influence of the Greek practice and theory gave both to speaking and writing a Grecian method and bent. The lack of originality in the Latin literary product is notorious. Yet there was some slight theoretical instruction in pub'ic speaking in the early republican days of Rome. The Senate and Forum taught by example. Cato the Censor spoke contemptuously of rhetorical studies, and Crassus (himself an orator) when consul warned the people against the encroachment of Greek studies in this art. But Crassus had himself studied the Greek rhetoric, and Cato in spite of his growling had drawn up a set of rules for speaking derived

mainly from his studies in Greek literature. One of his short rules is worth remembering: *Rem tene, verba sequentur.* About B. C. 100 formal instruction in both Greek and Latin literature and rhetoric is said to have begun at Rome. Mommsen (Vol. III., p. 565) mentions an ancient Latin treatise on rhetoric dating from the time of Sulla as being "remarkable not merely for its close, clear and firm handling of the subject, but above all for its comparative independence as respects Greek models." Julius Caesar wrote a treatise on the art of speaking correctly, and dedicated it to Cicero—a fact which the orator mentions with pride (*Brutus*, chap. lxxii), and proceeds to say that Caesar "laid it down as an axiom that an accurate choice of words is the foundation of eloquence." Cicero's own rhetorical works are well known—the treatise on Invention (derived almost entirely from Aristotle's *Topics* and claiming no originality), the famous dialogue on the *Orator,* and the *Brutus,* or dialogue on the *Celebrated Orators.* These were not manuals of instruction, but literary treatises, very pleasant reading and giving careful discussion from many points of view of the accepted principles of oratory traditional and prevalent in Cicero's time.

But the great Latin treatise on rhetoric is the truly admirable and exhaustive work of Quintilian, the *Education of an Orator,* or, as sometimes called, the *Institutes of Oratory.* In passing from Aristotle to Quintilian we make a great leap: in time it is nearly four hundred years; in culture it is from the Greek at its culmination to the Roman in its early decline; in men it is from a great all-round thinker and genius to a cultivated specialist of excellent talent but no great depth of thought; in works it is from the original and suggestive but incomplete and unpolished production of a master mind chiefly intent and notably great in other departments, to the highly elaborated single achievement of a sound judgment and well-read intelligence directed through a long life to this one task. Little is known of the life of Quintilian. Born, it seems, in Spain he came to Rome in the brief reign of the emperor Galba, and remained there a teacher of rhetoric all his long life, dying probably in A. D., 118, or thereabout. He was highly es-

teemed both in character and as a highly successful teacher. He was one of the first of those who received at Vespasian's order a salary from the public revenues of the city; and Domitian committed to him the education of his great-nephews, presumable heirs to the purple. By the same emperor he was invested with the insignia of the consulship—an event which is thought to have occasioned Juvenal's sneer: *Si fortuna volet fies de rhetore consul.* Quintilian was incidentally a pleader in the courts, but with all his heart a teacher of oratory. And the practice and teaching of a lifetime are condensed in his famous book.

This elaborate and satisfying production is wrought out in twelve books. It was actually written in about two years, though the studies, labors and reflections of many years lay back of its publication. It covers a wide range—as the course of education was in that age chiefly rhetorical—discussing many subjects which would now be classed in other departments of culture. It is complete in topics, thorough and discriminating in treatment, and attractive in style. The first book treats of the primary education of youth preparatory to oratorical training; the second book discusses the nature and principles of rhetoric; from the third to the seventh inclusive, the topics of invention and arrangement are considered; from the eighth to the eleventh, style and delivery are handled; and in the twelfth there is discussion of some important practical matters such as the orator's morals, principles, choice of work, retirement, etc. The work has always been recognized by competent judges as a masterpiece. It has, of course, greatly colored and influenced all subsequent teaching and treatment of rhetoric. It is far superior to Aristotle's work as a manual, as well as in the completeness and orderliness of its treatment, though falling below in originality and power of thought. The two treatises taken together represent the consummation of the Graeco-Roman rhetoric.

A word must be said in regard to the place of rhetoric in the ancient systems of education. It was a leading place. The so-called Seven Liberal Arts, as later developed and correlated, were: Grammar, Dialectic (Logic), Rhetoric—the *Trivium*—;

and Arithmetic, Geometry, Astronomy, and Music—the *Quadrivium.* The post of honor belonged to the first three; and as both grammar and logic were closely connected with rhetoric, they were considered as necessary parts of the instruction of the orator. For teaching rhetoric, with grammar (or literature) and dialectic, teachers and schools abounded in all the ages of the Graeco-Roman education. During the first five centuries of the Christian era rhetoric held the chief place in school education. Vespasian is said by Suetonius to have ordered that the salaries of rhetorical teachers at Rome should be paid out of the municipal treasury, and this is held to be the beginning of state education. But Julius Caesar is said to have had a similar scheme in mind; and he actually did establish schools in Gaul. After Vespasian various emperors added to the dignities and emoluments of rhetorical teachers, in some cases making their salaries a charge upon the municipal revenues of the chief provincial cities. Marcus Aurelius endowed chairs of rhetorical instruction at Athens. In A. D. 425 Theodosius II, established a grand imperial school at Constantinople, directly under state control and supported by the government. It had thirty-one professors, most of whom taught rhetoric and the related subjects. Thus at the time that Christianity ceased to be persecuted and became a care of government, a great system of education in which the theory of speaking was a central, and perhaps the leading element, had come to be thoroughly wrought out and established. Not only was education in this way chiefly rhetorical in tone, but a fondness for popular eloquence had also been developed and maintained, and in some sort a critical (though often vitiated) taste had been cultivated. It was into a society thus educated and trained that the longer, though part of the time parallel, stream of Biblical prophecy and preaching poured its new volume of power. And thus the preaching and homiletics of patristic and mediaeval times received their classic impulse. But we must now trace the other great line of descent.

THE BIBLICAL IMPULSE

Ancient oratory as described by Aristotle and others, lacks the religious and profoundly moral element. This we find in

the prophets and preachers of the Bible. Had Aristotle been as well acquainted with the prophets of Israel as with the Greek orators, and had Quintilian made an appreciative acquaintance with these prophets and the early Christian preachers, there would have, no doubt, been added to their division into Forensic, Deliberative, and Epideictic oratory the Didactic or Hortatory genus. After the arrival of the Christian discourse or sermon it is no longer possible to frame a complete theory of public speaking which does not include homiletics. We are ready to ask then, Do we find any traces of rhetorical, or as we may now say, homiletical, theory in the Scriptures? Preaching there is, and of the noblest sort; but along with the practice is there anything which may fairly be called theory or art? If the question means any set of definite rules for the composing and delivering of religious discourses we shall have to answer in the negative; but if it means that certain principles to guide in the practice of preaching may be found in the Bible, we shall have to say that at least hints and suggestions are given in both the Old and the New Testaments.

As to the Old Testament, granting that the prophets represent the proclamatory and the scribes the didactic, and both classes the hortatory, elements of preaching as a practice, are there any indications of a corresponding theory of religious discourse? Were there any accepted canons and any definite instruction as to the manner of giving religious discourses? It must be confessed that the data for forming an opinion on this point are somewhat scanty; but they are not wholly wanting. A slight indication is given in the provision for general education among the Hebrews. Three stages are recognized in the progress of Hebrew education: (1) the early period when home was the place and parents the teachers; (2) a later period, after the exile, when to the preceding there were added the scribes and the synagogue; (3) the last period, that of the rabbis and their schools. In all these it was incumbent on the learners to read and copy and repeat passages of the Scriptures. In the later times the public reading and exposition of Scripture seem to presuppose at least some instruction for the better performance of the duty. In all periods we know

that careful attention was paid to the very words of the sacred text.

There is a more definite indication in the literature of the Old Testament. Its general character, especially in the prophetic writings, gives evidence of more or less of training in the art of expression, both oral and literary. There is unmistakable indication of care and presumably, therefore, of previous instruction in oratorical composition. Of course natural ability must be presupposed, and the divine call and empowering must not be forgotten; but along with all this one cannot read the remains of Joel, Amos, Micah, Zephaniah, and others of the minor prophets, and still less the immortal utterances of Isaiah and Jeremiah, without feeling sure that these men had studied to good effect the best ways of making their messages impressive to their hearers. They were not only great orators but trained orators. They not only knew, but knew how. The case of Amos is of special interest because in a well-known passage (7:14, 15) he disclaims being a prophet or a son of a prophet. But this disclaimer seems to refer to his occupation prior to his call and authorization rather than to lack of technical preparation for his work. On the contrary Dr. Davidson (in Hastings' B. D., IV. p. 109) speaks of Amos as the "oldest literary prophet", and as having "the prophetic mannerism and technique". In the books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes there are a few striking traces of rhetorical care, implying at least some rhetorical culture. Wisdom, instruction, and propriety of speech are noted in Prov. 1:1-4; and in Prov. 25:11 we have a rhetorical principle of perennial importance: "A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in network of silver". In the classic passage of Eccl. 12:9-12 we find a "preacher", or master of assembly, who was himself "wise" and "taught the people knowledge", who "pondered", "gave ear", "sought out proverbs", sought "acceptable words", or "words of delight"; there is praise of "the words of the wise" which are as "goads", or incitements to action, and as "nails" which hold a structure together; there is mention of "many books" and of "much study", with cautionary advices. Certainly from hints such as these we may infer that

in the preparation of men for public duty as religious teachers, attention was duly paid to the study and selection of the language and form of discourse.

Further inference as to the existence of rhetorical instruction among the Hebrews may be drawn from their institutions: the order of Prophets, the order of Scribes, and the Synagogue. The long continued activity of an order of men whose chief duty was public religious speech certainly implies not only a body of traditional principles for the better performance of that duty, but also some instruction in those principles. The fact that so-called "schools of the prophets" are known to have existed adds force to this deduction, but too much force must not be allowed to it. For the term "school", as applied to these communities or bands of prophets, is not itself found in the accounts of them; and we have no means of knowing how much attention was paid in these guilds or communities to study and disciplinary training for the exercise of the prophetic function. We may not, however, resist the conclusion that there was likely to have been some such instruction; but it would be a violent assumption to discover in the notices of these "sons of the prophets" a description of a modern theological seminary with its course in homlietics! (See 1 Sam. 10:5, 10, 12; I Kings 20:35; 2 Kings 2:3, 5, 15; 4:1, 38, 6:1.) It is not important for our present inquiries to determine the time when the order of scribes arose. We find them well established in New Testament times, and they certainly existed long before then. Their main business was the interpretation and teaching of the law, but this was enlarged to mean the whole body of Scripture. So that theirs was primarily a teaching function. While thus the content of their teaching is the main thing, yet it is reasonable to infer some attention to the form also of their discourses. The hortatory or applicatory part of their teaching—called *haggada*—was really preaching. Prof. Robertson Smith, as quoted in Hastings' Bible Dictionary, says it was "doctrinal and practical admonition, mingled with parable and legend . . . . . It was recognized as a rule of faith and life, and embraced doctrinal topics, practical exhortation, embellishments and fabulous developments of Bible narratives."

It is scarcely to be denied that for instruction in this kind of teaching there must have been something more than example, though as to the amount and details of such technical training we are left to conjecture. The public worship of the synagogue—which most probably originated after the exile, in Ezra's time, or from impulses started by him—carried with it the teaching and exhortation based on Scripture. There are well known instances in the New Testament of the use made by our Lord and Paul of this custom. And it is not unlikely that in the schools connected with the later synagogues some instruction was given in regard to the suitable performance of the function of public speaking from the Scriptures. But here again there is only conjecture. Yet it is surely not an unreasonable inference, in view of the culminative evidence which has been presented that there was some kind and degree of rhetorical or homiletical instruction among the ancient Hebrews.

Can we find any traces of homiletical teaching in the New Testament? The historic basis of Christian preaching as such, both in its proclamatory and didactic forms, is of course to be found in the work of Jesus and his apostles. They preached both in the synagogues and in the open air, in private houses and other more retired places, as occasion offered or required. The content of their message is also well understood and need not here be considered. Among their teachings did they include any instructions which may fairly be called homiletical? Did Jesus and his apostles teach others *how* as well as *what* to preach?

First, let us inquire whether the teaching of Jesus shows any attention, either in his own practice or in his instructions to others, to rhetorical, or homiletical, principles? Let us waive the curious question of any instruction, general or homiletical, which in his human development our Lord may have received. It is not improbable that he attended the synagogue school at Nazareth; but that he owed much if anything, humanly speaking, to the schools, either as to the contents or the manner of his teaching is exceedingly doubtful. The astonishment produced by his teaching, its marked contrast to that of the

scribes, and especially the wondering question (John 7:15), "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?"—all go to show that the traditional lore and methods of the schools were little or nothing to him. But does his teaching show any care of form and method, as well as of content? Did he have and practice—we ask with all reverence—a homiletical method of his own? In his addresses as we have them there is wealth and variety of what may be called homiletical material. Scripture fills an eminent place, being employed as authority, quoted frequently, often expounded, habitually assumed as revelation, and reverenced as the word of God. Authoritative assertion, based on his glorious consciousness of truth, gave power to his speech and impressed his hearers as one of his most marked qualities. Yet also he frequently used argument with powerful effect, and that both in its direct and indirect forms; his refutative logic was often crushing. And what is to be said of his wonderful illustrations? From the more elaborate parables down to brief mention and passing allusion there was mastery of this method of preaching.* Thus in the Master's own practice we find the indispensable and perennial homiletical categories of Scripture, Experience, Argument, Illustration, all used with marvelous skill to the crown of them all; Application. But what of order and language, or in rhetorical phrase, Arrangement and Style? While we discover no prominence of logical order or distinctly marked analysis in the recorded discourses of Jesus, there is yet in most of the longer ones an evident order and progress of thought, showing that he was not indifferent to this element of power in public discourse. The fadeless charm of his language scarcely needs comment; at times sweet simplicity, then suggestive obscurity, poetic grace, logical strength, fitness to thought and occasion, moving eloquence—all were at his command. We do not find in our Lord's sayings or teachings any definite instructions which could be called homiletical; but his own example of careful speech, his remarks (Matt. 12:36, 37) about the value of words, his teachings on many other points of de-

*His application of truth to his hearers, both individual and general, is thorough, appropriate; often final.

tail in regard to hearing and preaching, his instructions in regard to prayer, and the general command to preach, may be taken as giving some hint at least that in his unrecorded teachings he may have sometimes touched upon matters regarding the forms and methods of presenting truth. It may be worth while to remark that the language of Matt 10:19, 20, cannot be interpreted as forbidding preparation for preaching; for it distinctly refers to over-anxiety on the part of the disciples in regard to their defence when they should be brought before rulers for the gospel's sake. (See also Luke 12:12, 21:15.)

In the Acts and Epistles there are some data from which we may infer at least a measure of attention to homiletical theory. The reported addresses of Peter in the early chapters of Acts show excellent homiletical skill. The narrative manner of Stephen's speech (Acts 7) suggests the synagogue method, as does also that of Paul in Pisidian Antioch (Acts 13). There is clear evidence in Paul's addresses of rhetorical training, both Jewish and classical. The short report (which most probably was given by himself) of the notable address on the Areopagus at Athens reveals not only a rare degree of oratorical skill, but the sure traits of culture. And the same may be said of the defence before Festus and Agrippa. In the Epistles there are a few data of interest. In 1 Cor. 1:17; 2:1-5, 13, we have the passages in which Paul depreciates as a medium of communicating the gospel "the words which man's wisdom teacheth", stating that on coming to Corinth he determined to "know nothing among them but Christ and him crucified." These utterances have been unwarrantably pressed in the interest of discarding proper study, and also in support of the unfounded hypothesis that Paul was conscious of having made a failure at Athens when he attempted to use oratory in its home, and came to Corinth chastened and determined to discard in the future any attention to rhetoric. All this seems to me utterly wrong. It is far more likely that Paul would have taken his speech at Athens as an illustration of the principle here laid down. For when we remember that the style of popular speaking in that sub-classical age was degenerate and tawdry, bombastic and extravagant, we must

see that the noble restraint, the sincere dignity, the faultless style of the Athenian address is as far as possible removed from the prevailing rhetorical fashion. It is good homiletics at any time and place to discard the meretricious aids of false taste and exaggerated conceits, and deliver a plain, chaste, straightforward message. This Paul did and commended. In the Epistles to Timothy there are several passages which contain excellent homiletical hints, though of course nothing like formal homiletical instruction. Among the qualifications of the bishop (1 Tim. 3:2) is that he shall be "apt to teach", implying skill as well as character and knowledge. In 1 Tim. 4:13-16 Paul urges that Timothy "give attention to the reading, the exhorting, the teaching"; that he should not neglect his gift, that he should "meditate on these things, and that he should "take heed to himself and his teaching". In 1 Tim. 5:17 he speaks of the elders "who labor in discourse and teaching". In 2 Tim. 1:13 he mentions a "form of sound words"—and though this refers probably to the body of doctrine, yet the phrase is significant. In 2 Tim. 2:2 he exhorts that what Timothy had received he should commit to "faithful men who should be able to teach others also"; in verses 15, 16 he urges that Timothy be diligent to be a good workman, shunning "profane and vain babblings"; and in verse 24 again insists on aptness to teach as an indispensable qualification for the minister. We cannot be wrong in inferring from these hints that a previous and continued training for the preacher's task would, in Paul's view, include attention to the manner as well as the content of his message. And on the whole we may say that while nothing like formal homiletical instruction in the modern sense may be found in the New Testament, yet there are clear indications that the ability to present the truth of God effectively in human speech is both exemplified and enjoined by the highest authority. And this surely is the essence and justification of homiletical theory. We come now to study the third and last of the ancient originative forces which resulted in the formation of a theory of preaching, or art of Christian discourse.

THE PATRISTIC IMPULSE

After the Scriptures the Fathers. The period embraced in the scope of this article extends from the Apostolic Fathers to Augustine. We must keep in mind that Augustine's epoch-making little book *On Christian Teaching* contains the first attempt to formulate and teach homiletical principles. With it, therefore, homiletical theory properly begins. The first three books were published in A. D., 397, the fourth in 426. So that for convenience we may take A. D., 400 as the dividing line from the ancient development, and let our present discussion fall between A. D. 100 and 400.

Within this important and fruitful epoch the two lines of development which we have already traced worked together side by side to produce a real theory of preaching at its end. The old illustration of two streams coming together is apposite here. After the junction each in a measure keeps its place till at 'ast there is fusion. The classical rhetoric and the biblical principles of preaching for a time flowed parallel in the same channel and finally mingled. The dominance of rhetoric in the school education of the time must ever be borne in mind. This had a double effect on homiletical theory: (1) It secured to the educated by actual culture, and to the uneducated by imitation and custom, the application of the common principles of rhetoric to preaching. An educated man entering the Christian ministry in that age could be safely assumed to know how to construct and deliver a discourse. We know that this was true of the great preachers; and what was the case with them was true of others to some degree. (2) But on the other hand the exaggeration, bombast, unreality, and sophistry which marked and marred the oratory and rhetoric of the age put many of the Fathers into a critical and cautionary attitude toward the rhetorical teaching then current. We have seen already that Paul probably alludes to these perversions in his remarks to the Corinthians about the "persuasive words of man's wisdom". We find a good deal of this caution in the allusions of the Fathers, and it was far from unnecessary. So that the attitude of the Christian teacher toward current rhetorical theory as applied to preaching was eminently a correc-

tive one. Theory did not so much need to be learned as chastened and applied to Christian uses.

In regard to the working out of biblical principles of public speech in the practice and teaching of the Fathers there are four matters of importance to be remembered: (1) The influence of the noble content of the gospel message and the Bible morality upon those who would set them before others must not be forgotten. This was a note which ancient oratory and the teaching of it never had. (2) More particularly the actual use of the prophets and apostles as models of effective religious speech, especially as they were regarded as immediately inspired of God, must not be overlooked. (3) But along with these considerations a most powerful influence in shaping homiletical theory was the very nature of preaching itself, as being primarily an interpretation and application of Scripture. As oral tradition declined and the canon of Scripture was formed and closed, and as the body of disciples grew and became diversified, the preaching became more and more an exposition and turning of Scripture to the spiritual and moral profit of the hearers. Thus arose the "homily", or talk, and the basis of it was a careful interpretation of the Bible. And so in all the after history of preaching and its theory the relation of homiletics to hermeneutics has been close and vital. (4) Nor must we forget that along with the authority of the word that of the teacher was an important matter. Paul had already recognized this, and with the development of the episcopate in the patristic age the appointment and authorization of the presbyters as teachers and preachers become highly important. This tended to increase the dignity of the preacher and render more needful his attention to the form of his discourses. And with this the leadership and care of the congregation had influence in determining the theory of pastoral duty in general and hence of preaching also. In the writings of even such great preachers as Gregory, Chrysostom and Ambrose pastoral care receives more attention than homiletical theory.

The writings of the Apostolic Fathers, so far as I have noticed, do not contain anything of value as to the progress of a theory of preaching. The discussion of teachers and

prophets in the *Didache* says nothing on the point; and the *Ancient Homily,* formerly known as the *Second Epistle of Clement,* is not a production of special merit as a sermon, nor does it mention or suggest anything of force as to rhetorical training. With the rise of the Apologists in the second century we come upon evidences of a more liberal culture in the Christian writers, and this naturally carried with it more attention to rhetoric. Tertullian—who on some accounts may be classed with the Apologists—was trained as a rhetorician and lawyer, and his writings show the influence of his training as well as the natural traits of the orator. It is not, however, till we come to Origen in the third century that we can feel at all sure-footed in dealing with our subject. In the preaching, teaching and enduring influence of that great scholar and teacher we begin to discover more distinct traces of a real art of preaching, and of instruction in its principles. There is no formal treatise on preaching among his works; but both Paniel and Nebe have collected passages from his homilies which enable us to present his homiletical teachings in a somewhat orderly way. It is a pleasure to acknowledge indebtedness to these scholars and to follow their leadership.

Origen's example and teachings encouraged a higher appreciation of the homily as a studied discourse. Before his time it had been only a loosely connected string of comments on the passage of Scripture selected. Nor does it in fact become much more than that in his hands; yet there is progress both in preparation and in form. But he is careful to warn against the abuse of rhetoric. He compares the prevalent rhetoric, dialectic and grammar to the leaven of the Pharisees, which the disciple of Christ should avoid, yet says: "But a lucid discourse, the splendor of eloquence, and the art of arguing are with propriety admitted to the sevrice of the word of God." Thus we see that it was the abuse and not the use of rhetorical principles that he condemned. In this connection it is to be remembered that Origen insists upon the preacher's character as essential. Indeed both Aristotle and Quintilian urge with all emphasis that the orator must be a good man; and the Christian teacher could surely do no less. The preacher,

according to Origen, must not be an artificial and ambitious orator, but a pure and spiritual man, a fit channel and instrument for communicating the word of God to his hearers. But the main element of Origen's homiletics was hermeneutical. He insists that the preacher must get his message from the word of God; and to this end, of course, study and interpretation are necessary. Origen did not invent but he did elaborate and practice what is known as the allegorical method of interpretation. In his time and in his hands there were three modes of interpreting any given passage of Scripture: (1) the grammatical and historical, by which the exact meaning of the text was sought and set forth; (2) the moral or hortatory, whereby the ethical doctrine of the text was applied to the hearers; and (3) the allegorical, or spiritual, whereby some mystical or hidden sense beyond the literal meaning and especially suited to minister to the spiritual life was wrought out and applied to the purpose of edification. Later the methods were increased to four by dividing the last into the tropological and the allegorical, or the figurative and the spiritual. The example and teaching of Origen did much to establish the allegorical interpretation as particularly appropriate to preaching, and it is due to him more than to any other individual, perhaps, that this abuse has been so persistent in all preaching since his time. The fathers of the Western Church, notably Ambrose and Augustine, adopted it with enthusiasm and practiced it with amazing ingenuity and power. But we must do Origen the justice to say that his motive in adopting and defending this spiritualizing of Scripture was primarily devotional and practical. He was earnestly intent on making every word of Scripture count to the "deepening of the spiritual life"—to use a modern phrase. And this purpose, in his mind, was of the utmost importance in preaching. Four points, then, will summarize Origen's homiletical theory: (1) The preacher's character must be sound and devout; (2) He must get his message from Scripture by a careful study of all its possible meaning, literal and figurative; (3) He must faithfully apply this meaning to life; (4) He must take thought for the form and method

of his discourse, using but not abusing the accepted principles of the art of public speaking.

In the earlier Latin fathers not much of importance for our study is found. As already remarked, Tertullian was a trained rhetorician, and the gifts of the orator were his also, but nothing is quoted from him—nor have I myself observed anything in such of his writings as I have read—in the way of a theory of preaching. Yet his practice and style were potent. Cyprian was an ardent admirer and follower of Tertullian, and his writings likewise show the training and practice of a rhetorician. In his letter to Donatus Cyprian speaks as follows of the relations of secular and sacred speech: "In the courts, in platform addresses let voluble ambition boast a wealth of eloquence. But when it is speech concerning the Lord God, then pure sincerity of speech rests for persuasives to faith, not upon the powers of eloquence, but upon things (*i. e.,* reality). In fine, use not eloquent but forcible words, not those polished to attract a popular audience by artificial speech, but simple enough to promlaim with plain truth the divine love". Surely this is good enough homiletical theory for any time. Paniel quotes similar language from Arnobius, who among other good things says: "When things far removed from show are under discussion, *what* may be said is rather to be considered than *how pleasingly* it may be said."

When we come to the Fathers of the fourth century it is necessary to bear constantly in mind two most important considerations: (1) The great prevalence of rhetorical instruction in the schools of the empire; and (2) the toleration and patronage of Christianity by the state. The educational and social advantages thus given to preaching profoundly affected both its practice and its theory. We find toward the middle and end of the fourth century one of the great historic culminations of preaching; and the five most famous pulpit orators of the age were, without exception, rhetorically trained. These were Basil, Gregory, Nazianzen, Chrysostom, in the East; and Ambrose and Augustine in the West—all of whom enjoyed in marked degree all that the best rhetorical instruction of the times could bestow. So also was it with others.

I have not found in my little reading of Basil anything at all upon the theory of preaching, but the more exhaustive research of Paniel brings out the following. He speaks in one of his homilies of the necessity of varying the style of discourse according to the subject and audience, and says: "For as a man whose business is war and another who pursues farming do not use the same implements. . . . . so also the preacher cannot use the same mode of speech when he exhorts to the acceptance of the faith and when he opposes adversaries." In another homily he urges that the discourse should be as concise and pointed as is consistent with clearness, "so as to show many things in few words, and on account of its brevity to be easy for the memory to carry away". These excerpts can only make us wish that we had more of Basil's theory.

There is not much from Gregory Nazianzen, but that little is worth while. In one of his songs (quoted by Paniel) he stoutly takes issue with the notion (its age is no recommendation to it!) that it is more pious to be unprepared so as to give free scope to the Holy Spirit. In one of his homilies also he speaks similarly and says it is better in an assembly to speak and hear five intelligible words than to pour forth an inexhaustible speech like a drum, but without edification. It is evident that this great master of sacred eloquence—no matter what his practice—at least in theory had no great respect for the sky-lark method of preaching—"profuse strains of unpremeditated art". We should look to find some homiletics in Gregory's famous oration at Nazianzus on his return from his retirement to Pontus, in which he discusses with eloquence and power his conception of the pastoral life and work. But it is mostly devoted to the practical and ethical side of the preacher's life, with little that even remotely bears on the theory of preaching. Teaching and preaching are named among the elder's duties, and adequate and studious preparation are insisted on, but character and wisdom rather than rhetoric are the main topics of this eloquent and thoughtful discourse. One sentence at least I must quote, where in speaking long and acutely of the folly of putting unprepared men into the ministry, he says: "And we may rightly, in my opin-

ion, apply to them the saying of Solomon, 'There is an evil which I have seen under the sun, a man wise in his own conceit'; and a still greater evil is it to charge with the instruction of others a man who is not even aware of his own ignorance." Chrysostom, Ambrose, and especially Gregory the Great, were all deeply indebted to this vigorous oration of the Nazianzen for their more elaborate treatises on the Pastoral Office. In his practice of eloquence Gregory was often betrayed into soaring and prolixity. Perhaps his theory was better.

The world-famous preacher, John Chrysostom (347-407) of Antioch and Constantinople, was carefully educated by Libanius, the best teacher of rhetoric of the age. His sermons and homilies, of which a great number remain, give constant evidence both of his native powers and of his excellent training and practice. The three parts of the typical preacher's work are well illustrated in this ancient prince of the pulpit. He was an admirable pastor, shrewd in his knowledge of human nature and faithful and loving in service of his flock. He was a careful and untiring student, especially of the Bible; his principle of interpretation being that of Antioch rather than of Alexandria; that is, he paid chief attention to the liberal and moral teaching of the word, with little or no allegorizing. And to crown it all he was a pulpit orator of the first rank. His practice is everything, and but little theory is to be found in his works. Scholars have culled from his sermons here and there passages in which he speaks of preaching. These set forth his homiletical principles. The preacher must found his discourse on the word of God, discard ambition for oratorical display and applause, and seek first of all the spiritual edification of his hearers. Over and over again these principles are insisted on. More technically, he says somewhere that an introduction is necessary to a well ordered discourse, for a number of reasons. And to this his practice agrees; his introductions are usually excellent. More than in the homilies we might expect to find Chrysostom's theory of preaching set forth in his famous and delightful treatise *On the Priesthood;* but he is here chiefly occupied with the pastoral side of the work, and does not say much about preaching. But that little is well worth remembering. (Reference is here made to the

translation of B. H. Cowper.) In Book IV., 3, Chrysostom asserts that ability to speak well is necessary for a presbyter, and adduces Paul as an example. In the following chapters he elaborates this and gives illustrations from Paul's writings in support of his argument. In Book V. he urges (c. 1) that to speak well requires much labor and study (c. 5) that the learned preacher must labor even more than the unlearned, and (c. 7) that he should compose his addresses with a view solely to pleasing God and not man. It is worth quoting what this eminent preacher says as to the need of work: "For since speaking comes not by nature but by learning, although one may attain to perfection in it, he who did not cultivate the faculty with constant zeal and practice would at last turn out destitute of it." That he conscientiously took pains himself is beyond all doubt.

It remains to mention the two great Latin fathers—Ambrose and Augustine. But as our next article will deal with Augustine's work on preaching our attention is here restricted to Ambrose, the eloquent and celebrated bishop of Milan toward the end of the fourth century. Ambrose had the conventional rhetorical education, and had been trained for the civil service. His practice was formed on that of the Greek preachers of the Alexandrian method of interpretation, and his allegorizing is excessive. I have found little if anything of homiletical value in his writings. In his treatise on the duties of the ministry he owes much (by way of adaptation) to Cicero's *De Officiis,* and much (by way of borrowing) to Gregory Nazianzen, but there is nothing of special interest on the theory of preaching. In his epistle to Constantius (Migne. Pat. Lat. tom. 16, col. 918, seq.) Ambrose says that a preacher's sermons should be flowing, pure and clear, that by his gentle arguing he may pour sweetness into the ears of the people, and by the graciousness of his language soften down the crowd that they may willingly follow him.

We see then that in the Fathers there are only scattered hints and traces of a homiletical theory, but that it was forming on the combined principles of the classic rhetoric and of Scripture. It was getting ready to find formal and enduring expression through the great mind of Augustine.

THE SOCIOLOGICAL FUNCTION OF THE MINISTRY

BY PROFESSOR FREDERICK W. MOORE, VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY.

Under the name of the priesthood the religious class has had a history as old as the immemorial traditions of society itself. Wherever a religious cult can be found there the religious class will be found also.

Not only is the religious class old, but it has also been powerful in history. It has been the peer of the military class. If neither has been able universally and permanently to dominate the other, neither has been able to get along without the other, and both have from time to time made the lower classes dependent upon them. Among some tribes and nations the priestly class has notoriously stood for selfishness, for corruption and for superstition. These cases may, however, be passed by as instances of abuses from which even so noble an influence as the priesthood is not exempt. More characteristic is it to say that the priesthood is an active and interested sharer in every phase of national life. It goes with the people to war and it celebrates the proclamation of peace. It stands sponsor for the monarch as he governs and for the people as they follow their various industries. Their humblest occupations and their noblest aspirations are known and shared by it.

Historically the priesthood has been a well differentiated body, a group, an organization, a sociological unit, performing its sociological function as such. Similarly the Christian ministry is something more than a mere aggregate of individual preachers, isolated missionaries, and Christian workers in separate fields. They whose field is the world and whose mission in life it is to serve their fellowmen constitute a body, a corps, a social unit, having characteristic functions as such, exercising great power as such.

Whether we include the larger body of Christian workers or the smaller body of ordained ministers, the organization of the class is not a mere analogy. It is something real. The medical profession, loose as its organization is, succeeds in maintaining and enforcing a professional code of ethics among its members by no other means than the threat to disfellowship those who

violate it. The legal profession is organized and has its code of ethics, and the National Bar Association is a body of recognized influence. The National Educational Association and the American Historical Association are bodies of teachers and students which by the simple means of membership fees, the circulation of literature, and the holding of annual conferences, inspire their members with professional enthusiasm and accomplish educational reforms of no slight importance.

The modern Christian ministry is not a body like the Brahmins, the sacerdotal caste of the Hindus; nor like the hereditary Levitical priesthood of the old Jewish nation; nor yet is it like the celibate priesthood, that powerful agent of the Roman Catholic Church. Christianity is emphatically propagandic, and we must look for an adaptation of the means to the conditions with a view to the accomplishment of the great end. The Christian ministry is democratic. It draws its constituents from the people at large. Membership in it is voluntary; none are constrained to enter it by any other force than the sense of their own duty. Its members distinguish themselves from members of other social classes no more than these do from each other; the nature of its duties requires a sobriety of conduct, a purity of thought, and a spirituality of soul not required of the others. Yet the ideal of the class is not to emphasize and perpetuate these distinctions, but to lessen them; not, however, by becoming like other men, but by teaching them —regardless of occupation—to cultivate purity and spirituality. In point of method, also, the modern evangelical denominations stand in contrast with the authoritative hierarchical organization of past times. Instead of the coercive power that can compel men there is substituted the force of rational and moral conviction which mightily disposes men to will to do that which reason, morality and religion approve. If there is an element of weakness in that men cannot be ecclesiastically compelled to conform to the codes of civil, moral and religious conduct recognized by Christians, there is an element of untold strength in the assurance that a man who acts from conviction adds the weight of his influence to that social force which he would deplete were it necessary to exercise it in compelling his obedience;

and there is in addition the sublime confidence in that harmony which must exist between God's nature and law and that expression of them in finite terms, comprehensible to human minds, which we look for in the fundamental principles of religion.

Again, as to the scope of the interests which Christian workers and the ordained ministry especially may properly cherish, there is much more to be said than there is here either space or occasion to say. If there is a fallacy in the argument of the Pope, there is also a rich suggestiveness in his claim as head of the church universal that the monarchs of the world are the bounden agents of the church, holding the inquisitorial power of administration and the temporal power of the sword at his service for the discipline of heretics and the conversion of the pagan. If our religious conceptions are right they are fundamental, comprehensive and exclusive. Nothing which is inconsistent can be tolerated; nothing which could be looked upon as indifferent can be allowed unless it conforms. So all matters that pertain to society and to individuals must be tested by our religious ideas, to be sanctioned or prohibited by them, the amenities of social intercourse, the rules of industrial activities, the diversions that occupy the hours of relaxation, the principles of government, the standard of public and private morals; none of these may be sanctioned if it conflict with the development of Christian morals and spiritual religion; all that are sanctionable must conform to and contribute substantially to this development.

It would be superfluous in this connection and it would lead us aside from our purpose to discuss in detail whether and how we can find religious sanction for the current code of moral conduct and social intercourse and the current political and industrial institutions. Two things only it is within the scope of this paper to discuss: first, whether, proceeding scientifically, with minds entirely neutral, open and uncommitted, we can trust the principles of social science to lead us to put the same high value on the work of the Christian ministry, on morality, religion, and spirituality, that we put upon them, proceeding from the standpoint of religious institutions and biblical revela-

tion; secondly, whether or not science has anything helpful to suggest in the way of analysis which will enable us the better to appreciate the adaptation of the Christian ministry as a means to the ends we seek through it, or in the way of new methods or of convincing argument that will promote our ends and confirm our results. If, as we firmly believe and assume, there is an essential harmony between God's nature and being and the works of His universe, then science, which is essentially a method for increasing our knowledge and comprehension of that harmony, should help us to a deeper appreciation of it. If it has contributed so much in the domain of things material and things social already, may we not with confidence still use it?

First: It is an accepted function of the ministry to teach the Bible; and science supports and confirms the Christian view of its importance.

Is there anywhere in history or philosophy, physics or metaphysics, a body of moral truth more helpful, more important to mankind than is contained in the Christian Bible? Magnify the noblest thoughts of profane writers as we may, neither Shakespeare nor Browning, Ruskin nor Carlyle, has a message that will compare. Neither the Confucian nor the Buddhist nor the Mohammedan system can afford a satisfactory substitute for that system which begins with the revelation of monotheism to the Hebrews, and concludes with the atoning sacrifice of Christ on Calvary for the sins of the world, Jew and Gentile alike. Before a body of Mohammedans, of Buddhists, of pagans, of materialists, of atheists, the proposition would have to be supported by a line of vigorous argument. What the Christian preacher takes for the axiom of his life a man predisposed by birth and tradition and training to another system will with difficulty be brought to admit. It would be necessary with him to resort to the methods of science because they are neutral and common and accepted by both Christian and non-Christian. It would be necessary by long analysis to ascertain what these systems of philosophy purported to offer and what human needs they purported to satisfy. It would then be in order to show that the Christian system recognizes

the same and even nobler ends and offers a more satisfactory answer.

In passing let it be noted as an encouraging sign of the times that the Bible is coming again to be studied as perhaps it has not been studied since the days of the Reformation, when Coverdale and Tyndale and the King James translators placed it, printed and in the vernacular, before a people hungry for its precious truths. Bible study has been reintroduced into college curricula and college Y. M. C. A. courses. Bible and mission study classes are numerous and earnest and devout. Surely the revision of the King James version and the application of ripe scholarship to Biblical interpretation has contributed to this result. Have the new methods of literary study which have been introduced into our classrooms within the last fifteen or twenty years been put to their best and fullest use when they have helped us to interpret the literature of the Elizabethan age, the stirring liberty literature of the period of the French Revolution, and the literature of the Victorian age with its message of social reform? Prof. Moulton would say not, and in demonstration of his opinion has edited the Modern Reader's Bible. Taking the accepted text of the revised version without theological note or doctrinal bias, he has treated the Holy Scriptures as he has treated less sacred literature. He has given it a modern literary form, dividing it into paragraphs, separating episode from episode, giving to each its distinguishing title: be it the genealogy of David; the census of the tribes; the orations of Joshua; the song of Deborah; the prophecies of Ezekiel; or the apocalypse of John. He has invited us to study Job as we would study Browning, to study the Psalms as we would study the sonnets of Wordsworth and the lyrics of Tennyson, the prophecies of Isaiah as we do the biting criticisms of Carlyle, the gospels and epistles as we do Ruskin and Matthew Arnold. Is this reducing our sacred literature to the level of the profane? Is it not rather applying a method which we have tried successfully upon profane literature to the nobler work of helping us interpret the fullness of meaning in the Scriptures? If by this method we can get ennobling thoughts out of Shakespeare, Browning, Wordsworth,

Ruskin, Carlyle, George Eliot and Matthew Arnold, shall we doubt that by the same method we can get profit out of the literary study of the Bible?

A second function of the ministry is to evangelize.

Christ's commission to His disciple's to evangelize the world is specific, abiding and imperative. The work enjoined by this supreme authority will not be complete when the gospel has at last been preached to the remotest heathen. It will have to be continued as long as there remain unconverted at home. As often as generation shall succeed generation and the years of infancy shall pass into years of discretion and judgment it will have to be renewed. So long as it is demanded that a man shall consciously, as an act of will, repent, be converted, turn his back upon unworthy ideals, and set his heart upon godliness, even so long must there be earnest, persistent, unremitting evangelization. Even so long must there be Isaiahs standing in the high places to denounce: "Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help." Even so long must there be John Baptists crying in the wilderness: "Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance and begin not to say among yourselves: 'We have Abraham to our father.'" Even so long must there be Pauls reasoning "with them from the Scriptures, opening and alleging, that it behooved the Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead; and that this Jesus . . . is the Christ."

It is almost appalling to reflect how many there are now enjoying the blessings of what we may properly call Christian civilization who, rejecting godliness, persist in wickedness and unholiness. If the principles of Christianity mean as much for men in the world as the Christian realizes they mean for him and believes they mean for others, his sense of social duty, *noblesse oblige*, will compel him to preach the gospel, a dying man to dying men.

Thirdly, it is the mission of the ministry to promote spirituality in Christian life.

Spiritual-mindedness is not valued and cultivated as it should be. One phase of evangelistic work seems to discredit it. "By grace have ye been saved", is the burden of evangelistic preaching, thereby expressing a great and fundamental Chris-

tian truth. "By grace", "through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God." The blood of Jesus Christ and the grace of God are sufficient to save any who will believe. This is a fact; and a tremendously great and gracious fact to the repenting reprobate in the eleventh hour of his earthly existence, when his excesses in wickedness are bringing him down prematurely to the grave. But it throws for the moment into the background another religious truth, equally fundamental and of immediate practical importance throughout the long life of the child religiously trained by Christian parents or of the man converted to God in the prime of life.

It is agreed by all Christians and practically by all philosophers that man has a threefold nature: physical, intellectual and spiritual, that he has both a mind and a soul in his body. Now it is a matter of common experience and observation that he can develop both mind and body. It is recognized as an obligation with a moral sanction that he should cultivate both. If now the soul of man partakes, as we believe, of the nature of God, who is Spirit, we cannot by analogy consent to believe it to be so insignificant part of ourselves as even Christians by their conduct seem to make it. Is the spiritual faculty to remain uncultivated, undeveloped, until the decay of the mortal shall set the immortal free? Is there nothing in the world of to-day, no pleasure in living on God's earth in the midst of His works, among men whom He has created in His own spiritual likeness, which we could enjoy through our spiritual nature here as well as hereafter if we but set out to develop it more?

No doubt spirituality is a difficult virtue to cultivate. The Hebrews not only had the advantage of teachings which God revealed through holy men, but he himself appeared to them in theophanies and taught them. Yet would they not hear and learn. Their history is one long series of relapses into idolatry, superstition and formalism. It is sad, but it is significant that such was their experience; and human nature has not changed so very much since. The very virtues of our modern civilization seem to hinder the growth of spirituality. Men are constrained to live honorably, deal justly with their neighbors,

and give generously out of their abundance in benevolence not only by the precepts of religion, but also by the obligations of public esteem. But with that we are too well satisfied. The constraint stops short of the obligation to cultivate spiritual-mindedness as a supreme virtue.

The spiritual nature ripens and mellows slowly and men come to wear it naturally only after long experience in cultivating it. Yet it is properly reckoned an important qualification for the calling of the ordained ministry. Spirituality is power. Therein lies the strength of those Christian workers, neither sensational nor eloquent, who draw men, busy men, worldly men, hardheaded, unsentimental, intellectual men to sit at their feet and hear the simple gospel preached. In this age of boasted morality the thing which is most rare among Christians is spirituality. It is the thing most needed to convince the world of the reality of religion, because without it religion is insufficient to convince and with it religion would be complete; for it is the logical crowning part of the Christian philosophy of religion.

Again, fourthly, the minister, the Christian ministry as a class, is the great champion of morals and teacher of righteousness.

Pilate asked with a sneer: "What is truth?" In the same spirit might such an one ask: "What is right?" seeing how different people insist on calling different things right when it would appear reasonable that only one thing can be right under given circumstances. One standard of right and wrong is the law of the state. Another standard is public opinion, with which in the long run the laws of democratic states must coincide. With formalists the presence or absence of a thing in the *index rerum prohibitorum* is sufficient to decide. This spirit of formalism was rebuked many times by Christ, notably when he defied the Jewish law regarding Sabbath observance in such a way as to make it plain that it is the fitness or unfitness of the means to the end which makes the means right or wrong. He thus put the responsibility upon us and left it for us to decide by reason, instructed intellect and enlightened conscience what is right and what is wrong. Surely there are

many reasons why we should have the responsibility of deciding for ourselves; otherwise we would become the slaves of an unchanging rule in the midst of changing conditions. The idea would be absurd and the reliance would weaken the moral fiber of our character. This being the case, we see the important function of the teacher of morals. Those who presume to instruct us as to our moral standards must be the most discerning in knowledge, the most discriminating in judgment, animated by the broadest, noblest, purest motives and most refined and spiritualized conceptions of God's nature. Not only will they be called upon to set the ideal standard by which to guide the conduct of the individual Christian; they will also have to indicate that which shall be made the standard of discipline in our churches. They will have to set a higher standard than the common opinion of the public around them or than the law of the state will recognize. They will be called upon to oppose and denounce the public standards in the pulpit and in the market place too; and in so far as by their efforts they can strive to raise them.

It may be assumed as the fundamental basis of Christian morals that the moral laws enjoined in God's word are not arbitrary injunctions, the mere sport of omnipotence commanding because it must be obeyed. Surely there is reason and justice in God's decrees. Surely his moral laws are such as conform to the great purposes of His universe. Things are right because they promote, and wrong because they interfere with, his all-wise fatherly purposes. If His universe is one and all things in it make for the upbuilding of His supreme ends, things in it are to be judged according as they promote these ends. Are we not justified in positing the development of the race as the immediate and the perfection of the individual as the ultimate end? And may we not lay it down as a practical principle and working hypothesis that things are right or wrong according as they contribute to these ends?

Roman Catholics have made marriage a sacrament. Protestants give it the sanctity of a religious rite and throw the protection of religious obligation about it. Now it is notorious that the state has declared marriage a civil contract and as such void-

able for a large number of causes specified. So long as public opinion sanctions and the state is prepared to grant divorce for minor causes it may be safely assumed that there will be those who will take advantage of the opportunity lightly to dissolve the marriage bonds regardless of the teachings of Christian moralists and the discipline of the churches. The situation is a real and a serious one, and the issue must be faced. Let the moralist beware of destroying his opportunity to exert an influence for good by denouncing divorce dogmatically and arbitrarily, simply on the ground that it is forbidden by the Bible, an authority which, from the circumstances of the case, it is evident that the community does not regard on this point. Rather let him assert his confidence that the prohibition is in the Bible because it is founded in the reason and the eternal fitness of things for the good of the race and the good of man. Let him therefore respect it and exhort others to respect it. Stooping to conquer, let him state the proposition—which will be generally accepted—that practices against public welfare must be discountenanced and prevented. Then the issue can be joined directly on the question whether the practice of divorce and the remarriage of divorced parties, as now permitted by law, does or does not come under the rule. Let the question be studied scientifically to find out. The family is a social institution of prime importance. Its importance for the nurture and education, the industrial, moral, religious and spiritual training of the new generation is plain. Is its efficiency menaced by the present practice of divorce? Are divorces growing more frequent? Are there other deleterious influences exerted upon public morals by the practice? Does not the New Testament condemnation of them point to some consideration, perhaps not readily appreciated by us at present, which ought to be recognized and which, being recognized, would plainly justify the prohibition? The National Divorce Reform League has long been at work agitating the question. The practice of many ministers and churches and denominations is strongly pronounced in favor of the stricter and higher morality. Public sentiment seems to be ripening and attaining to the same conviction. Let us urge our convictions with the

force of all the evidence and argument which we can command in the name of mankind and mankind's God; and let not the slowness of the progress and the occurrence of many obstacles discourage us and deter us from our efforts.

The same is true of the liquor traffic. The law of the land regards whisky as property and protects it as jealously for its owner as it protects those other articles which the conscientious moralist will consent to own. The law declares the liquor traffic legitimate under certain conditions and as plainly protects it within those limitations as it penalizes severely those who exceed the limits. Surely there are many who think that the manufacture, sale and ownership of liquors ought to be limited still further. The common basis for determination, the only effective criterion, is public welfare. Cultivate a sensitive discrimination not only as to what contributes to public welfare, but as to what contributes to the highest and most refined public welfare. Then devote your best energies to showing how seriously the public welfare is involved, and in due time the public sentiment that has provided for denying his liberty to the man who steals, and for punishing capitally the man who murders with malice and premeditation, will surely stop the liquor traffic. This is not putting morals and righteousness on a low plane. It is assorting arguments which will convince according to the intellectual and moral limitations of those whom we would convince in order that we may so win them to the support of our higher ideals.

In the matter of the liquor traffic it is now more apparent than ever that the moralist has a great ally in economics. Men who have property and business interests at stake are coming to recognize that those men are the most reliable servants whose moral habits are good. This appeals to the lower, selfish ends. But it is very effective because these ends can be appreciated by people who are not yet prepared to appreciate the broad public ends and to cherish the highest motives.

There are also social diversions and pleasures and many other things that, not necessarily wrong, may easily be abused or used to mislead others.

I have often been much interested and instructed in studying

the paradoxes of the Bible. There are principles which are antithetical, contradictory. Yet each restricted to its proper sphere of application is rich in admonition and wisdom. "Come ye out from among them and be ye separate" is one. "The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till all was leavened," is another. They point to two fundamentally different conditions and indicate the action appropriate to each. The one points to certain things which the sociologist in his terminology designates as unsocial and which the moralist calls demoralizing, irreligious, and despiritualizing. The principle with regard to them is that they must be utterly discarded and cut off, tabooed as unclean. The other contemplates some things that may be quite harmless or neutral in themselves, at least are not so positively bad in character and so actively deleterious in their influence but that by putting the good in contact with them they can be redeemed and made good. To them the propagandic rule applies: Put with them things of the character which you would have them acquire and let them be assimilated. The rule is perhaps especially popular in these days. Our civilization is so high, has to such an extent come to be based on Christian principles, that we are encouraged to go further. It is urged that our religion should not be a thing of the closet or of the Sabbath and public worship only. It should be carried into our business, our pleasures, into everything we do. Christians should not keep out of employments or diversions because the irreligious and immoral abuse them. They should go in, carry their religion with them, and rescue them for high and noble and spiritual uses. This is plausible, it is public-spirited and noble, it is ideal. Amusements and diversions like card-playing, theater-going and dancing; professions like politics and business, in some lines of which conformity to high ethical principles is none too scrupulously observed, are cases in point. The ministry, to which we look for leadership in morals, would do nobly if it could succeed in rescuing some or all of these for high uses. Especially do we need innocent diversions in which we can seek relief from the stress of toil and recreation without deleterious effects. But there

is danger lest the thing which we wish to reform should prove to have the stronger nature and should leaven with unrighteousness instead of being leavened by righteousness. Evidently both principles must be applied concurrently. There are some things which must be cut off utterly because spirituality, religion, morality and the lesser principles of social science unite in denouncing them as anti-social and unholy. Some things we ought to seek to leaven because they are socially and spiritually sound in principle and because we are strong enough to undertake to deal with them. Still other things we must be more cautious in taking hold of now lest they degrade us. Here, as elsewhere, it must be made clear that it is beyond the limits of this paper and beyond the specific purpose in hand to settle these questions. Most of them cannot be settled in a day nor within the lifetime of one generation. Some, if not all of them, will require aggressive campaigning. It is hoped that it will be thought worth the while, since there is a hard battle to be fought, to state the issue squarely. More especially it is the purpose in hand to show that the issue is not an issue of religion and morality for their own sakes alone, as though they were something separate and apart from all forms of worldliness. On the contrary, the issue is a social issue for society and for the good of the individual whose perfecting is to be sought through social means, and of religion and morality as social forces. Finally it is an issue for the ministry to take hold of and lead in by precept and example, not simply as seeking to bring men into conformity to the laws laid down in the Bible, but as showing that society reaches the fulness of its development in the everlasting principles there laid down.

Again, the ministry must be the censor of our social institutions, economic, political, and the like.

When one laborer strikes work, dissatisfied with the wages and conditions of labor and unable to negotiate satisfactory terms with his employer, we say that the principle of freedom of contract applies under which dismissal by the employer or strike by the employe is a sufficient and satisfactory remedy. But when fifty men, 500, 5,000 men, 50,000 coal miners strike, dissatisfied with the hours, wages and conditions of labor and

unable to negotiate a satisfactory settlement with the combined coal mine operators, we find that neither the principle nor the remedy applies. In such cases the strike or the lockout inevitably leads to intimidation, violence, boycott, and great sacrifices by an innocently involved public. In the present organization of industry serious disagreements between aggregated employers and aggregated employes are unavoidable. The aggrieved party in each case will say that it is in a dilemma: it must either submit to an injustice at the hands of the other party or it must resort to methods that are against law, unrecognized by law, and that amount to a modified warfare between social classes. Society has nourished in its bosom an industrial organization which it cannot control. There is need of a remedy. The economist and the statesman must do their parts; there is something for the ministry to do also.

Once again. If a man going alone stumbles he can get on his feet again. If a man stumbles in the midst of a surging crowd it will trample him to death. In the simple conditions of agricultural life poverty is seldom distressing, and by thrift the poor can ordinarily succeed in redeeming themselves from poverty. But to be poor in the city, without work, without health, is to starve; and the honest and industrious and frugal and God-fearing are as helplessly crushed under the industrial juggernaut car as the thriftless. If they are few they suffer and perish and no one hears. If they are many they cry aloud bitterly in their discontent and threaten a social revolution. They deny God, despise religion, and hate the church because God, religion and the church belong to their enemies and join with their oppressors. The situation is at times appalling. Moses of old looked upon the burdens of his brethren and saw an Egyptian smiting a Hebrew, and slew him. "And he went out the second day, and, behold, two men of the Hebrews strove together; and he said to him that did the wrong, Wherefore smitest thou thy fellow? And he said, Who made thee a prince and a judge over us?" and Moses feared. The task may be difficult and perilous, but the conditions must be faced and the issue must be met. The problem is an economic one and the remedy must be economic, no doubt; but the ministry as a

class must participate. The contending classes are industrial; the ministry is neutral and so suited to mediate. The state is looked upon as the protector of property and vested rights and on the side of the property classes; and the standards of justice and the principles of equity which it recognizes are those calculated to protect property. But the ministry is a class which must look higher to find the guiding principles of its conduct and the standards of its judgment. For the sake of society and for the sake of religion as well, the ministry must vindicate the higher law by which it is necessary that men should regulate their conduct in order that man, the noblest part of God's created universe, may by the equity of his rules and the harmony of his social functioning bear witness to the goodness and the holiness of his Creator.

With this thought I close. I have tried to show that science is not simply a body of accumulated knowledge, but essentially a method for ascertaining knowledge. I have tried to show that social science points out the best means for elevating the individual through the development of society, especially since the ideals which the Christian holds dearest all find their proper places among the noblest ideals of social science. I have tried to show that while the individual is but an atom in comparison, the social group of many individuals permeated by a common purpose and stimulated by a common interest is unmistakably great. Moreover, each group has its peculiar and appropriate function. In particular, those men whose glory it is that they have been called by God to the work of the Christian ministry, a great, grand, united, powerful body of workers devoted to social service, are engaged in performing functions—in teaching the Bible, in evangelizing, in promoting spirituality, in perfecting social institutions, and in promoting the highest standards of morals and righteousness—which social science ranks highest. Thus does science magnify this sacred calling.

THE CATHOLICITY OF CHRIST.

BY REV. WILLIAM RUSSELL OWEN, BALTIMORE, MD.

There is real ground to-day for the serious question, "Has Christianity ever been fairly tried?" or perhaps, "Do Christians accept seriously the teachings of Jesus?" The cry of to-day is, "back to Jesus", "a return to Christ", and these phrases are retrospective. It has occurred to the writer that it is of sufficient dignity to inquire whether the real ground of Christianity rests upon either retrospective or prospective ideals. Christianity is Christ, and the basis of Christianity is a tenseless ideal which must needs be constructed by the apologists of each day out of the preserved sayings of Jesus himself. Is there not a universal plan, a programme for the Christian state for all time in the sermon of Jesus, termed by us the Sermon on the Mount? Platitudinal treatises and exegetical studies have been exhaustless on this sermon, but consider this analysis of the Sermon on the Mount in the light of the Catholic teaching of Jesus, in short, the Catholicity of the Christ. I believe the Sermon on the Mount to have been a single deliverance, previously prepared, perchance written, and spoken by the great Christian Teacher to the multitudes on the Kurn of Hattin.

Christ first appeared in the temple. Now, from this seat on the hills, under God's open sky, Christ utters thirty years of calm, transcendent thinking to the multitudes who had gathered to hear.

In a wise, this sermon is the Magna Charta of the Kingdom of God, yet no demands were wrested from a reluctant John. And, too, we might say this is the manifesto of the King, the speech from the throne, but I am persuaded that there is set forth in this sermon as reported by Matthew the Catholic teaching of Jesus—the setting forth of such abiding principles that here is the universal constitution of a

kingdom eternal. Says William Burnett Wright: "Of all teachers, dead or living, of all friends, visible or invisible, not excepting the Apostle Paul among the departed and those who are dearest to me among the living, none has ever helped me to find sight for my mind or rest for my spirit except in such proportion as he has helped me to understand the Sermon on the Mount. I believe it contains the true solution of every problem which has troubled mankind in the past or troubles men in the present; the key to every perplexity; the weapon against every danger; the balm for every wound; the assurance against every anxiety which any man can meet; the setting forth, I am led to believe, of a final and satisfactory meaning of the atonement of Jesus the Christ."

The Sermon on the Mount is the setting forth of a final philosophy which, if you please, I shall term the philosophy of the affections. This is set forth in the two pre-eminent ideas which Jesus Christ came to teach man, namely: the idea of the Kingdom of God and the idea expressed by the term, "My Father"—the Kingdom of God and the Father. The corollary of the idea of the Kingdom of God is the perfected system of Christ's ethics; the corollary of the idea of the Father is the universal principle of love. You will find in the Sermon on the Mount these two ideas, ethics and love, running on in parallel lines, each necessary to the other, equidistant from the other, tantamount one to the other, but signally bearing in themselves enough knowledge in the complex relation of man to God and God to man, as to satisfy man in his ceaseless quest after God. The Sermon on the Mount then is the end of the quest for God. The supreme quest of man is the quest after God, the conquest of man is made when man finds the Father whom he has not sought. So then here is a study in concomitance in which the love of the Father is set forth as the principle of all action, in the expression of which man and God are brought under the harmony of reconciliation.

This is a broad claim for the Sermon on the Mount, yet I ask that you follow with me the historical search of man

after God and thus discover a philosophical basis for this paper.

It has ever been thus—the blind search of man after God. There is something pathetic, I think, in the anxiety which everyone shows to rediscover himself. Carlyle wrote nearly seventy years ago: "Into how many strange shapes of superstition and fanaticism does the silent searching of man tentatively and errantly cast itself! The higher enthusiasm of man's nature is for the while without exponent, yet does it continue indestructible, unwearily active, and work blindly in the great chaotic deep; thus sect after sect and church after church, bodies itself forth and melts again into new metamorphosis." Carlyle was right, for whether we find the historical origin of the religious principle, which means the struggle out of torpor and discord into unity and light, in the theanthropic conception of a co-equality in man and God, or to the theocratic conception of a sovereign God, or else to the Polyzoic deification of the nature principle, the struggle has been that of man in search of God—the harmonizing, if you please, of the undiscoverable qualities which man knows reside in himself with the existing of a sublime reality which man calls God—the search in a bewildering labyrinth for Him and from the maze there is no escape.

In the world at present there are but six great religious ideas: The great Chinese ethical system of Confucius, the older non-resistance simplicity of Laotsze, the cynicism of Brahma, the speculation of Buddha, the Jewish fanatical sacerdotalism, and the Christian declaration of love. Count Leo Tolstoy, in an article in La Revue of Paris, declares that "Christianity unites, explains and defines all the older religions, but after Christianity no religion appears, no prophet explains and defines his doctrine. All that appears in this sense is only the elaboration and application of Christianity. Indeed, all the systems of religious teachings that now exist, in so far as they contain any truth, are included in Christianity."

So man has been searching after God, but, oh, the little

faith of blind generations, who were left to be shown by this Teacher of Nazareth that the good woman of the house had been the while searching the silver, that the shepherd of the sheep had been searching the lost, that the Father had been missing the son.

Many seminary days I wrestled much with the theology which obtains in the dry places of the earth, and I wrote at the completion of the study upon the margin of my text book: "I have studied this matter faithfully and I think satisfactorily to my teacher, and I am convinced that we cannot reach God through reason. But I know God I am sure, and am persuaded that it is true, because long, long ago He has reached me with love."

"Religious experience," says Dr. Adolph Harnack, "is to be measured, not by any transcendency of feeling, but by the joy and peace which are diffused through the soul that can say, 'My Father'." "Thou hadst not sought me hadst thou not known me", is the trite saying of Pascal, and the great joy of man comes in the conscious finding of the Father.

There are two realms of knowledge—the realm of science and the realm of the soul's experiences; the one we prove by demonstration, the other we do not prove at all. The one is worthless without the laboratory, the other is worthless when its fingers feel the nail prints of its Messiah. The soul's experiences become transcendently real when demonstration is proven futile and the unblossomed sprig of faith gives promise of a fragrant fidelity in the cry from the truant disciple: "My Lord and my God."

All ethnic study of religions reveals the fact that previously to Christianity there was no religion which was free from the objective element. Idolatry substantizes its ideal; Greek and Roman mythology bodies its ideas in sacred things. Judaism must objectize its monotheism in the tabernacle idea. The American Indian is neither idolater nor the worshiper of the Invisible Mystery, except as he holds sacred the game that he shoots and the wild plants that he plucks. Moses endured as seeing Him who is invisible, but the least in the

Kingdom of Christ is greater than Moses, because he believes better than Moses, yet without the Sinaitic vision. Christianity, on the side of appeal and response in worship, is wholly subjective.

The credo of the realm of science is, I believe what I see; I believe what I feel; I believe what I taste, what I smell, what I hear. The creed of the soul's experience is: "Blessed are they who believe yet have not seen." Evolution as a science is undoubtedly true, but must needs spend sleepless nights in the laboratory. The Old Testament speaks of the heart as being the seat of the issues of life. "Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life." "As he thinketh in his heart, so is he." The heart is not only then the seat of the affections, but of the mind, and indeed in the proverbs, of the will, since the Scripture saith: "My heart trusted in Him." This idea is expressed in the Greek word, *splanchnon*—"bowels of mercy and compassion". So Jesus Christ came and made his religious appeal to the heart-seat of the Old Testament, to the bowels-seat of the New. This is the realm of the soul's experiences of religious appeal, and the soul's response. Jesus came then with a message to the inner ear of man which alone might hear; He came to appeal to the realm of the appreciations. Now in the realm of the appreciations there lie the universe of ethics, the universe of aesthetics, and the universe of religion. The universe of ethics discerns that there is an oughtness and oughtnotness in this world of ours—a right and a wrong—and has to do with reason. The universe of the aesthetic observes the quality of love and hate, and has to do with the feelings, while the universe of religion realizes out of its pre-eminent consciousness that the harmony of these two, ethics and worship, lies in the submission of the self to the control of a sovereign guide, wherein lies the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus Christ sets forth the ideal character of the ethical kingdom in what we commonly call the Beatitudes, then consistently, unswervingly, he pursues this idea with its concomitant thought that love to the Father

is the motive of all action, then with the appeal to submission he sets himself up as the one foundation of life, and characterizes the man who builds not upon himself as building his hopes on sand.

Sociologically, Christianity is a life—Christian ethics; philosophically, Christianity is an acquaintance—a devotion to the Father; religiously, Christianity is a response—the answer of man to God.

What then shall be the final test of Christianity? It shall be the test of the principles set down in this Sermon on the Mount. Tolstoy declares this Sermon on the Mount to be his rule of conduct in life, and the wise find fun in his folly, but it must be even so. Dr. Charles D. Williams, dean of Trinity Cathedral, Cleveland, in an article in McClure's Magazine for December, says: "The great problem before Christianity to-day is the integration of the common conscience." In other words, the understanding that ethics cannot be divorced of love, nor love of ethics.

"There are stories of our gigantic business enterprises which have climbed to dizzy heights of unprecedented financial power." By indirect evasion and overt fractures of both moral and statute law, men have iniquitously prostituted brilliant abilities and strong purposes. And yet who are they who do such things? They are often gentlemen who are scrupulously correct in their personal behavior, sober, chaste, temperate. They are good husbands, kind fathers; their home life is above reproach. They are even orthodox, pious and devoted in their religious life. Where is the flaw? "It seems to me", says Dr. Williams, "to lie in a lack of moral co-ordination, a divided and disintegrated conscience. These men have attained and fulfilled their ideals of morality in their personal conduct and relationships and their technically religious life. In these regions they exhaust their conscience, but in their commercial relations and business life they have no standards whatsoever. They are here morally blind." So then the real test of Christianity, the final test is the test of this sermon of our Lord. Love prompting life is the word.

There is no holier or higher sphere of life to-day than the mayoralty of a great city, which calls for this higher gospel. Opportunities are bare for the mutest heroism and the manliest sainthood in the field of commerce, governments and religion. "There are new quests for the new knights of to-day, infinitely better than a crusade for the rescue of the Holy Sepulchre from the hands of the infidel", and that Christian citizen who lives the Christian life, who has learned this catholic thought of Christ, love and life—worship and ethics co-ordinated—will become the character who shall eventually inherit the earth. The idea of the Father and the Kingdom of God eventuates in a perfect life normalizing out of a God-like heart.

I have now come to that part of our discussion where I feel I must succinctly lay down the principles of the Sermon on the Mount; that is all I can hope for in the brief compass of this paper. The Sermon on the Mount is the constitution upon which the Christian State is builded. It is a sermon of constructive principles, and the illustrations for these principles, genetically annunciated, are so abundant that to choose the best were a task well nigh impossible. Jesus proceeds, above everything, logically. The character of the constituents of the Kingdom of God is set forth in the Beatitudes, then this new creature is compared in his flowering life to the religious standard of Phariseeism at that time existent, after which the Christ sets forth a positive religion, in the perfected relationship of man to God.

Will you follow me in this brief analysis with the two ideas of an ethical kingdom and the love of the Father in full view?

I. The Ideal Citizen:
1. Seven Beatitudes, Matt. 5:3-9.
2. An ethical preserver, Matt. 5:13.
3. A way shower of love, Matt. 5:14-16.

II. The appeal to:
- 1. Ethical appreciations:
  - State, Matt. 5:21-26.
  - Home, Matt. 5:27-32.
  - Individual, Matt. 5:33-37.
- 2. Aesthetical appreciations:
  - Almsgiving, Matt. 6:1-4.
  - Prayer, Matt. 6:5-15.
  - Fasting, Matt. 6:16-18.
- 3. Religious appreciations:
  - Mind, Matt. 7:1-6.
  - Affections, Matt. 7:7-13.
  - Will, Matt. 7:14-20.

If you will examine later Jewish literature, which is closely akin in thought to many of the Psalms of the Old Testament, you will find that the word "poor" directly denotes those who have their hearts open and are waiting for the consolation of Israel. Jesus found this usage of speech in existence, and his first beatitude was meant straight to those poor in spirit whose hearts were open to God: "Blessed are the poor in spirit." An open heart is the first step which one must take to enter the kingdom—the member of the kingdom who deplores his poor attempt at acquaintance with God is happy because a personal relationship is promised him through a comforter—"Blessed are they that mourn." Meekness finds itself in the ideal character which expresses perfectly the superior ethics of the kingdom and the meek thus become the pre-eminent swayers of affairs. It is the affections which hunger and thirst and yearn to appropriate the qualities of God and these four characteristics: desire for God—poor in spirit; a personal relationship to God—the mourner and comforter; an ethical likeness to God—meekness; and a yearning after God—hunger and thirst, form the four characteristics of the perfect character of the kingdom on the manward side. Blessed are the merciful, blessed the pure in heart, blessed the peacemakers, are the Godward characteristics of the members of the kingdom.

The parallel still is preserved in these last three, the merciful love of the Father and ethical purity which has for its prototype the holiness of God. There is a splendid

progress in these seven beatitudes from the narrow gate of entrance along the way of the rough ascent which leads to a cross. "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." Here in this early sermon is the foreshadowing of it all. The peacemaker has ever been earth's divinest emblem. The peacemaker, whether it be the lowly disciple treading the via dolorosa, the martyred monk in the Piazza della Signoria, or Jesus, the poor man's minister on the Hill of Golgotha. The peacemaker is he who brings God and man to meet together, who maketh mercy and morals kiss each other, and peace only cometh after war.

Ye are the salt of the earth—ethical preservers. Why did you write your "Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire", they asked of Gibbon. "To prove that Christianity is a failure", he answered. "Then why do you commune at the church on every Sunday?" was the next question. "Because the common people could not be controlled without Christianity." Ye are the salt which is to make savory the vapid, inane undercrust of life, and to be the preserver of putrescent society. "Ye are the light of the world." He who came to be the light of the world becomes to be formed in His disciples, and that light which has shone neither on land nor sea is transmitted downwards through the centuries and outwards to the uttermost part of the earth to the end of all that Christ wrought and said the glorifying of the Father who is in the heavens. The light of the world is the love of the Father.

You will then notice in this chapter those marvelous plays at contrast of the Christian teachings with current conceptions: The contrast of the Mosaic murder law with the anger of the heart; the contrast of the Mosaic adultery law with the lust of the sense; the statute limitation in foreswearing to the sober control of the individual. These are the three partitions of any society—the State, the home, the individual. The State, from the nature of facts, must be the governor of the personal safety of the citizens; the home is concretly the sphere of adulteries aspersions, while the in-

dividual is the unit of personal and undelegated approach by Christ. "If thy brother compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain." The principle of love is laid down in these succeeding illustrations as the motive which controls the ethicizing of the State, the home, the individual. This represents Christ's Kingdom of ethics.

All worship, or better the aesthetics of religion, I think, is compassed in the threefold divisions of Jesus in the sixth chapter of Matthew—alms giving or eleemosynary activity; prayer or aesthetical communion and fasting or an asceticism of self renunciation—work, worship, sacrifice are the principles. So the motive for all worship Christ sets forth in the love principle of the added words: "If God doth so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall He not much more clothe you, oh, ye of little faith? Your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things."

Then comes the appeal of Christ for men to submit to Him as their controller, fitly divided into the seventh chapter.

There are three ways of approach to God: First, through the mind, which is set forth in the discriminative presentment of Christ to cast not your pearls before swine; second, through the affections, which is set forth in the simple declaration, "If thy son ask a fish, will ye give him a stone? If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask Him." The third, and necessary, approach is through the will, which is an act of submission. "Enter ye in at the strait gate." That is it—the call of the centuries through Christ to find God through the person Jesus. "For not every one that saith to me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of heaven, but he that fruits and produces the will of my Father which is in heaven." "Every one that heareth these sayings of mine and fruits and produces them, shall be likened unto a wise man which built his house upon a rock, and the rain descended and the floods came and the winds blew and beat upon that house, and it

fell not, for it was founded upon a rock." This is the Sermon on the Mount, beginning at the baptismal drama at the Jordan, ending at the tomb of the Arimathean. Beginning at the birth of the new spirit in our own experience, ending at the cross of service. Oh, there is such a catholic span bridging the eternal silences, over mortal time, to the great and heart-revealing day of the Lord!

So you have gotten my thought I hope—that the end of the quest of man lies in the catholic teaching of Jesus. No theory of the atonement has taken hold upon me with lasting grip or even with satisfaction. The ransom idea of the Fathers is a fundamentally true idea, but it is fundamentally wrong in the thought that Christ was compelled to pay the price. The Federalist idea of the headships of Adam and Christ is true, but wrong when it makes the ordained headships the arbitrary act of God. The Governmental theorist says that the law of God was broken and justice demands a fitting punishment to annul the sin. That is true partially, but this view looks upon God as capricious, as imposing penalty and punishment at his will. And so with all the theories. They have filled searching students with inglorious despair and the insane wards with pious theologians. There is but one point of universal agreement in the atonement of Christ, namely, that God is a sovereign. I am finding at last that this peroration of the Sermon on the Mount has in it the answer to my own unrest, and I am prone to style it the atonement of submission to the Person of Christ. The way of life lies through submission of Jesus to His Father and of man to Christ. The principles of Christianity, as here defined by Christ and expotentiated by the martyred apostles, inevitably lead to a cross. The Sermon on the Mount does not make mention of the atonement, but the life it sets forth leads to the submissive cross life. It is taught by Christ, "Blessed are ye when men shall persecute you and say all manner of evil against you falsely—Rejoice and be exceeding glad." The apostles, Peter and Paul, insist upon the necessary death element of the cross in the atonement and rightly, for the apostles were but expositors of the principles

of this Sermon on the Mount. Jesus taught this at the temple feast when the Greeks came to inquire, "Father, glorify thy name", and I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." That is it, the atonement by submission of Christ to the Father, by submission of man to Christ. "I lay down my life that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down myself. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father."

Ritschlianism is not all wrong in laying heavy stress on the Person of Christ. "The certainty of faith", they hold, "springs immediately out of the experience of the revelation of God in Christ. It is the direct result of the impression which Christ makes upon the soul historically confronted with Him. You come into the presence of Christ as He meets you in the Gospel page. The impression He irresistibly makes on you is that in Him God is drawing near to you. It is no reasoned conclusion, is connected with no metaphysical view of the Person of Christ, but is simply a *faith,* the result of the irresistible compulsion exercised by Christ over those brought spiritually into contact with Him." (James Orr.)

Somehow in Christ comes the call for control, the plea to submit. Jesus in this Sermon on the Mount answers all the great questions that have troubled man. He answers the question of origin. "Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow—Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these." Love clothes them. The source of all life is love—love in action is the lily of the field, the infinite, tender sky; cosmos sprung out of the touch of love. The question of society, what shall preserve it? Jesus answers the problem of the law courts and ecclesiastical contortionists about the divorce question with the simple answer that the unifying principle of all society is love, and it is true. The question of man's freedom? Man is sovereign in his own sphere, and God is sovereign in his own sphere. Man is limited in God's sphere and God is limited in man's. Submission to the person Jesus answers to the sovereignty of God in desire for control and

declares the freedom of man in his voluntary submission. The supreme question of all, the question where lies the seat of religious authority, is answered by Jesus in the clear phrase, "Whosoever hears these *words of mine* and produceth them". There is the question answered—submission to Jesus, the person—not to the Scripture ultimately, not to the intimations of man's spirit, but to Jesus Christ Himself.

When Jesus sent out his disciples and they had come back weary and sick, and forespent and discouraged men—Jesus answered and said, "Come unto me and learn of me, for I am submissive and lowly at heart and ye shall find rest for your souls". That is the call to every poor soul, to every one who bears a human face; it is the plea of the Father for control, of Jesus, the Son, for submission.

Jesus the Christ, born of mystery, reared in obscurity, suddenly came to maturity; among teachers a teacher, among philosophers a philosopher, among religionists a religionist! But we do not think of him as greater than Socrates or Plato, or Mohammed, but we think of him as a man head and shoulders above all men. And he speaks for submission as one having authority, not as the scribes. Jesus, by virtue of his own sinlessness, speaks with authority. The greatness of Jesus Christ lay, not in the princely genealogy, but in the wooden shoe of the peasant, not in rising above men, but by descending beneath the crust of life. Hence his silent greatness. He sought no will but His Father's. He had no thought but to submit. His soul was still before God, content in the possession of quiet submission. His life was a perfect self-possession and serene self-reliance—all gentleness and joy because "of myself I do nothing, except the things which my Father shows me".

Jesus loved the Father, and out of the perfect love there normalized the quiet life which went out among men to live sinlessly and effect their common good. "This fruitful work fell to his share, not because he secularized religion, but because he took it so seriously, so profoundly, that while in his view it was to pervade all things, it was itself to be freed from everything external to it." (Harnack)

Jesus Christ is the catholic man—the contemporary of the ages, and his teachings are the aorist tense, the same yesterday, to-day and forever. Christendom has never understood its Christ. We are beginning to see. You and I know better the catholicity of the Christ than did the apostles. The world was not ready for the preacher of the Sermon on the Mount, so it cast him out. It is not ready yet. The preacher of the Sermon was led out to die, and so we, for the servant is not greater than his lord.

They have said that the Sermon on the Mount is not so important as is the Sermon on the Cross. I assert that the Sermon on the Mount is the Sermon on the Cross; and the Kurn of Hattin foreshadowed the Mount of Olives.

His mission was the fulfilling of a vision of humanity, sinning and sinned upon, and the great soul saw and understood.

It is a great gospel we preach, a triumphant truth, a catholic Christ. Sidney Lanier, the master musician poet, whose rhyme-melody has long been all too poorly valued, puts it thus in his "Marshes of Glynn":

"Ye marshes, how candid and simple and nothing withholding and free,
Ye publish yourselves to the sky and offer yourselves to the sea!
Tolerant plains that suffer the sea and the rains and the sun,
Ye spread and span like the catholic man who hath mightily won,
God out of knowledge and good out of infinite pain,
And sight out of blindness and purity out of stain."

BOOK REVIEWS.

I. SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

Systematic Theology. A Compendium and Common Place Book designed for the use of Theological Students.

By Augustus Hopkins Strong, D.D., LL.D., President and Professor of Biblical Theology in the Rochester Theological Seminary. In three volumes. Volumes I and II. American Baptist Publication Society.

We cannot do better than begin this review by quoting the opening paragraph of Dr. Strong's Introduction: "The present work is a revision and enlargement of my 'Systematic Theology', first published in 1886. Of the original work there have been printed seven editions, each edition embodying successive corrections and supposed improvements. During the twenty years which have intervened since its first publication I have accumulated much new material, which I now offer to the reader. My philosophical and critical point of view meantime has also somewhat changed. While I still hold to the old doctrines, I interpret them differently and expound them more clearly because I seem to myself to have reached a fundamental truth which throws light upon them all."

In the second paragraph he explains the new viewpoint.

"That Christ is the one and only Revealer of God, in nature, in humanity, in history, in science, in Scripture, is in my judgment the key to theology. This view implies a monistic and idealistic conception of the world, together with an evolutionary idea as to its origin and progress."

Dr. Strong's Theology has been too long before those who are especially interested in this great subject to need very much reference to its general features, which are all preserved in the new and larger work. It is a Compendium of the most comprehensive character. It includes the general range of subjects, in some works on theology, relegated to Introduction

and taken for granted. There are discussions of the chief views held on the most vital subjects in all eyes. Perhaps disproportionate attention may be thought to be given to some ancient beliefs in comparison to that devoted to some of the questions and views which are at present agitating the theological world. But there are few phases of thought on this great subject which do not receive attention. It is also a storehouse of the best thought on all the great range of subjects treated of with their most important aspects. We know of no work on theology which is comparable to Dr. Strong's as a thesaurus of the most pertinent literature covering this immense area. This is especially true of this enlarged book in which this part has been greatly enriched. There is impressed into this work the gist of a great library. Like all excellent features, this may be a temptation. Some may be satisfied with the quotations given and be less desirous of reading the outstanding works in full. With others, it may but whet the appetite for a fuller acquaintance.

Dr. Strong's division of his treatment into a multitude of distinct sections and sub-sections is favorable to a more minute analysis and a more detailed discussion; but the student is liable to lose his way in them, and fail to grasp the general logical connection which reveals the unity of it all in one great system. One who pursues this method may also find it more difficult to be self-consistent through it all. It is too much to say that Dr. Strong has altogether escaped this danger from his method.

But then the reader will be most interested to know how the adoption of what he terms Ethical Monism has affected his general theological position. The surprise is that there is so little change. Scarcely a general statement in the previous editions has been elided; very few have been modified. The new sections added—and they are not so very many—are supplemental rather than substitutes. For the most part it is reading the same conclusion from what is thought a better metaphysical basis. But the changes and modifications of his views, if carried to their full legitimate conclusion, would be far from trivial.

Dr. Strong declares his position to be that God is the single "substance, ground, or principle of being". If this means merely that God is the source and necessary support of all beings, it is not monism—neither is it new in theology. If it means that God sustains all things through his immanent presence and power, this also has been long held and taught, but perhaps not enough emphasis laid upon his immanence as compared with his transcendence. I cannot but believe that Dr. Strong, in his general treatment of God's relation to the universe, uses "substance" in this more usual sense. This is involved in his doctrine of Creation. He says: "Creation is not the fashioning of pre-existing materials, nor an emanation from the substance of Deity, but is a making of that to exist which once did not exist, either in form or substance." II. 372. Here "substance" means the essence of that which constitutes the being of a thing. Now God is here said to have originated that which constitutes the being of the universe. It could not have belonged then, to God's own being, up to this time, neither can we believe it can now, without holding that he added to his own essential being at creation—an impossible conception. God's essential being and that of the universe must then be separate and distinct, according to his use of the term "substance" here. If he is its one substance, as Dr. Strong says above—it can only be as the source and support of its being, not as constituting a part of his own.

So also is his explanation of God's relation to the universe in Christ. "Matter is no longer blind and dead, but is spiritual in its nature, not in the sense that it *is* spirit, but in the sense that it is the continual *manifestation* of spirit." Vol. I. 109. Matter then is distinct from spirit. It is not of that which is the essence of his being. God as Spirit manifests himself in something which does not belong to his essential self. This so far as it goes, is but a statement of the view always held. Dr. Strong, however, almost commits himself to the view that all matter is but the continuous operation of the divine will. But he may mean no more than that all the forces manifested in and through matter are but the power of the divine will, a view to which some of us have long been inclined. But when

Dr. Strong refers to the relation existing between God and man, his monism is real: "Substance, ground or principle of being," here means that which constitutes, rather than what sustains, being. Take this expression, I. 109: "If within the bounds of God's being there can exist multitudinous finite personalities (men), it becomes easier to comprehend how, within those same bounds, there can be three eternal and infinite personalities (the Trinity)—indeed the integration of plural consciousness in an all-embracing divine consciousness may find an analogy in the integration of subordinate consciousness in the unit-personality of man." Also II. 757: "Because Christ is essential humanity, the universal man, the life of the race, he is the central brain to which and through which all ideas must pass. He is the central heart to which and through which all pains must be communicated." This means that our being constitutes a part of the being of God or Christ. Our very personalities, with their thoughts and feeling and consciousnesses are integrated in the all-embracing divine consciousness, and have as real a place in the being of God as have the personalities of the Trinity. The "ethical" element of his Ethical Monism is plain. It consists in men having personalities of their own distinct from that of God, and a freedom which makes them responsible and guilty as sinners. I., 106 and 107. This ethical element, the recognition of God's transcendence as well as his immanence, and the recognition of his personality, constitute the distinction between Dr. Strong's view and pantheism.

The limits of this review are too narrow to permit a discussion of the question whether this ethical feature can be reconciled with the Monism as above explained. Dr. Strong thinks we can be metaphysical monists and psychological dualists. But can we? Notice what seems to be involved. What constitutes a part of God's very being is finite, is not under his moral control, becomes morally corrupt, is liable to his own wrath, brings the consciousness of pain and guilt into the all-embracing divine consciousness, etc., etc. Does this not bring what are absolutely irreconcilable—the finite and the infinite,

the holy and the sinful, etc.—into the very being of God, and make the mystery of moral evil altogether insoluble.

Dr. Strong's evolution, to which he feels his ethical Monism commits him, is of a very mild type. There is no eternal existence of the substance of the world, neither has it been fashioned by irrational forces resident in it. Its progress has been shaped by the immanent action of God. It is then really development as usually distinguished from evolution—which does not differ much from the old theological view. Even in the case of the life of the world it is altogether different from that of Darwin. He, in the first place rejects spontaneous generation. On II, 470, he gives the fullest statement of his view: "No single instance has yet been adduced of the transformation of one animal speices into another, either by natural or artificial selection; much less has it been demonstrated that the body of the brute has ever been developed into that of man. All evolution implies progress and reinforcement of life, and is unintelligible except as the immanent God gives new impulses to the progress. Apart from the direct agency of God, the view that man's physical system is descended by natural generation from some ancestral simian form can be regarded only as an irrational hypothesis. Since the soul, then, is an immediate creation of God, and the forming of man's body is mentioned . . . . in direct connection with this creation of the spirit, man's body was in this sense an immediate creation also." This means that God by his immediate and special agency made it so that new and higher species were born from the lower, until man appeared. As he explains of man, "he came not *from* the brute but *through* the brute" II, 467. With no spontaneous generation to account for the origin of the first life, and with the origin of species—some of them at least—and of man through mediate creation in the wombs of lower types. Dr. Strong's evolution, in this realm, is practically equivalent to the out-and-out creation views. It is only a different method of creation. Whether this hypothesis will conciliate the regular evolutionists remains to be seen.

He prefers a definition of miracles which will permit miracles

to be explained naturally as science advances (Schleiermacher's view) but holds to their full attesting power.

He is favorable to the Documentary Theory of the origin of the Hexateuch as held by the more moderate radical critics, accepting also the dates and the order they give of the three codes—Book of the Covenant, probably written by Moses; Deuteronomy, produced in Isaiah's time; Levitical, post-exilic. Yet he holds the books of the Hexateuch genuine and inspired. The creation, flood and fall stories, and all those of the patriarchs are not myths, but historical, etc. Whether a mediating position of this kind can be held, in view of all that enters into consideration, seems to me more than doubtful. If we go with them so far as does Dr. Strong, it seems necessary to keep on.

In his definition of Inspiration a marked change is apparent. Inspiration is said to be "that influence of the Spirit of God upon the minds of the Scripture writers which made their writings the record of a progressive divine revelation, sufficient, when taken."

There is no dispute that the revelation of the Bible is progressive; but does it require a sincere enquirer to take all this revelation together and then have it interpreted by the Spirit to have sufficient *knowledge* to seek and find salvation? This carefully prepared definition leaves room for error, even in the moral and religious teaching of the inspired. Indeed, he proceeds to say II. 198. "We may reasonably presume that he will not trust this revelation *wholly* to human *tradition* and *misrepresentation*", etc., (italics mine), implying that he has not altogether saved it from these perverting influences. But in his further treatment there is little departure from the old conservative position. He rejects the Intuition and Illumination Theories as before and reaches the conclusion (I, 216), "Inspiration is therefore not verbal, while yet we claim that no form of words which taken in its connections would teach essential error has been admitted into Scripture." He also refuses to admit that even errors in matters of Science, History, Morality, in Reasoning and Prophecy have been found in the Bible, although he thinks its inspiration would not be invalidated by errors in "historical detail", or by wrongly employed

Rabbinical methods of reasoning. I cannot but be sorry that Dr. Strong has not adequately embodied—as I venture to think—the strength of his able treatment of this vital subject of Inspiration in his definition.

But it is in connection with the doctrine of Original Sin and of the Atonement, especially of the latter, that his monism exerts a decisive bearing upon a part of his discussion, and is used to reinforce his general Augustinian position.

This Natural Headship view is made all-determinative over all this ground. It is here that Dr. Strong exerts all his strength, and the discussion is very able and complete. The view is carried through with relentless finality. It is only as mankind were seminally in Adam and shared in his fall that men can be justly held responsible for their own fallen natures and the sinful acts which spring from them.

I frankly confess to the strongest doubt whether we are justified in staking man's responsibility and condemnation for his corrupt nature and sinful acts upon so narrow and questionable a ground, and have sought to find a better basis for it all. It requires us to believe that human spirits are propagated as well as bodies, a view which probably has the balance of opinion against it. It depends almost altogether upon a challenged interpretation, or a challenged application, of a single passage—Rom. 5:12sq. It gives as the ground of all human responsibility and guilt that which does not appeal to moral consciousness, but has this consciousness instinctively against it—that we are justly guilty of an act in which, even admit we were seminally in Adam as to the substance of our souls, we did not consciously and personally share any more than in any deed or all the deeds of all our ancestors. It demands that infants and those who never become morally conscious be thought justly exposed to the eternal wrath of God, even though provision has been made for the deliverance from it of all who die before waking to moral consciousness.. The Scriptures generally appeal to men as conscious of guilt because of their personal sin, or through their personal sin, and not because of an unconscious and impersonal sin in Adam.

But it is when Dr. Strong carries his Augustinian views

through into the doctrine of the Atonement that he parts company with the most who, in the main, agree with him, and that his monism culminates. It is here more than anywhere else that Dr. Strong is convinced he makes his special contribution to theology.

In his earlier elaborations of his view, it was our Lord's human nature sinning in Adam which gave him a guilt and condemnation of his own to expiate, which was thought to have made it possible for him to act for all the race. In his present thought, it is rather because of the race being in Christ as a part of his substance or very being that he not only could suffer for men, but that he must suffer for them. In the one case it was because our Lord was a part of the race. The monistic view changes this to the race being a part of him, although both ideas are still retained.

I confess I cannot see how our Lord's having the sin and condemnation of Adam's sin upon his human nature can be the explanation why he can be a propitiation for the sins of all. After stating that Christ, as holy in nature and act, could nevertheless have guilt upon him which he needed to expiate because his human nature was in Adam and shared in his sin, Dr. Strong proceeds: "If it be asked whether this is not simply a suffering for his own sin, or rather for his own share of the sin of the race, we reply that his own share in the sin of the race is not the sole reason why he suffers; it furnishes the subjective reason and ground for the proper laying on him of the sin of all", II, 758. With deference I submit it that the exact opposite of this conclusion is true. If our Lord must have guilt of his own upon him before sin can be properly laid upon him, must it not follow that he can suffer for sin only so far as he has guilt of his own to expiate, and that no other than his own sin can be laid upon him? This was Dr. Strong's older view before he adopted his fuller Ethical Monism. This new viewpoint has led him to go much further. It is not given in his new work with the clearness and explicitness we find it in his "Christ in Creation and Ethical Monism". But it can be gathered from detached statements. Christ is "essential humanity", "the universal man", "the life of the race", "the cen-

tral brain", "the central heart", II, 757. All finite personalities are included in the bounds of his being. I, 109. In other words, the all-inclusive nature of humanity is included in the all-embracing being of Christ. "Christ's union with the race in his incarnation is only the outward and visible expression of a prior union with the race which began when he created the race", II, 758. Because of the moral evil brought into the being of Christ, he has suffered from the beginning of sin—we suppose of the fallen angels as well as of men, although Dr. Strong does not mention the former—and must continue, as a necessity of this evil existing in his own holy being, as long as it continues. This suffering is the real atonement. "Christ, therefore, as incarnate, rather reveals the atonement than made it. The historical work of atonement was finished upon the cross, but that historical work only revealed to men the atonement made both before and since by the extra-mundane logos," II, 762. Our Lord was responsible for allowing evil to come into his being, and as mankind contributed a part of his being, he shared in their sinning. I cannot otherwise understand his statements of II, 758 and elsewhere: "I cannot justly bear another's penalty, unless I in some way share his guilt. The theory we advocate shows how such a sharing of our guilt on the part of Christ was possible. All believers in substitution hold that Christ bore our guilt. . . But we claim that by virtue of Christ's union with humanity, that guilt was not only imputed but *imparted* (italics mine) with Christ's obligation to suffer, etc." I venture to say that in Dr. Strong's treatment of this phase of his subject, there is an obscurity, because he does not clearly distinguish between his views that Christ's human nature was in Adam and had the guilt of that first sin upon it—which, he says, made it possible for him to expiate guilt which was not his own—and this monistic view which includes all human nature in his own being, and makes him share in its guilt because the guilt was *imparted* rather than *imputed* to him. In this last view he states the principle that no one can suffer penalty, unless he shares in the guilt which deserves it. No one can then become a *vicarious* sacrifice. Our Lord, then, only suffered for his own guilt, that

which was imparted to him or was his own in some other way. But can guilt be imparted except through the impartation of the sin which brings it? The imputation of sin would not *impart* its guilt. But is not the impartation of sin to a moral being, who has not been induced to commit it, utterly out of the question? and a moral impossibility? The imputation of sin with its consequent guilt has its difficulties; but this which is involved in Dr. Strong's view—either the imputation of guilt without that of the sin which causes it, or the impartation of sins to one which he does not commit—is a moral contradiction. Neither would the natural and necessary reaction of Christ's holy nature against the moral evil which is alleged to have come into his being in man who is said to be a constituent part of it, constitute any *impartation* of guilt, for, as necessary, it is not a moral act. Nor would it be because of an obligation to suffer. In order for our Lord to have upon him an obligation to expiate the guilt of all men for whom he died, he must have been guilty himself both for allowing sin to enter his being and for all the sin of man in all ages—a terrific conclusion. In any case, even though we accept the idea that two independent moral beings can become responsible for the sin in which only one shared, would not each have his own guilt still, and if no one can suffer for a guilt not his own, the bearing by Christ of his own guilt could not help men so far as their own guilt was concerned. Unless our Lord was guilty or became guilty of all men's sins so that man was no longer himself guilty, he is in desperate need of a propitiation which, on Dr. Strong's principle, Christ could not render. But who can believe that man is rendered, by any such relation to Christ even as that alleged to exist. *Ethical* Monism of Dr. Strong's description really shuts men out from redemption, as it seems to me.

Notwithstanding passages of Scripture given in support of his views, I cannot but believe the Bible teaches that it was only as he had *no* guilt of his own to bear that our Lord could expiate the sins of all the ages, and not because the guilt of Adam's transgression was his, or the guilt of all men because they are of his substance. He took upon him that

which was not his own and not what he was under "obligation" to bear. The sinlessness of our Lord and the voluntariness of his suffering are insisted on in the Bible, especially in Hebrews, or trustworthy exegesis is out of the question.

The view, also, that our Lord's life on earth and his death on the cross did not *make* atonement, but merely were to *reveal* an atonement by pre- and post-incarnate sufferings, cannot be drawn from the Scriptures by any fair interpretation. It is his death which is said to *be* the propiation, not to show forth an atonement made outside his life on earth. This view would reduce the cross to a mere scenic display, and would be little better than the Docetic of old. All over this ground, I have to confess, that Dr. Strong's monistic view, notwithstanding its ethical element, and even because of it, seems to me to be, not only unsupported by Scripture but to contradict its plainest meaning. It therefore appears to me to be a choice between the latest phase of metaphysical thought, if it really *now* be its latest phase, and the Bible interpreted without biass ing presuppositions. I have been able in this review only to reach the principle features, and them but inadequately.

I have had the unpleasant task of paying chief attention to the bearing of his new metaphysical view upon his general positions, and from my standpoint, have had to criticise all too much to be agreeable. I wish to say, in closing this review, that as far as the great facts of sin and guilt and Christ and atonement and salvation are concerned, he holds substantially the old positions. In the treatment of the atonement itself, he gives full value to the death of Christ. It is only when he seeks to explain how Christ could make this atonement, that his Monism covers it with its risk of sweeping away the foundation for a vicarious sacrifice altogether. It is a monumental work in its comprehensiveness, in its suggestiveness, in the wide range of the literature of this great subject both embodied and referred to, in the strength and conviction with which it holds to the great facts of man's nature, condition, salvation and destiny. I cannot do better than close this review with a quotation from his Introduction, written on his seventieth birthday, to show Dr. Strong's

loyalty to the great central truths of our people, notwithstanding what I have written, and because I felt I must, by way of criticism: "I am distressed by some common theological tendencies of our time, because I believe them to be false to both science and religion. How men who have ever felt themselves to be lost sinners and have once received pardon from their crucified Lord and Savior can thereafter seek to pull down his attributes, deny his divinity and atonement, tear from his brow the crown of miracle and sovereignty, relegate him to the place of merely moral teacher who influences us only as does Socrates by words spoken across a stretch of centuries, passes my comprehension."

The second volume ends with the discussion of the atonement.

C. GOODSPEED,
Baylor University, Waco.

The Infinite Affection.

By Rev. C. F. McFarland. Pilgrim Press, Boston, New York and Chicago. Pages 174.

Individual confessions of faith have their own interest and value. The theology of a young man who says he is in sympathy with the modern thought is the outline in this book. By "the infinite affection" he means the love of God, of course. Love is fundamental in God's nature. God must love. He may be just. We can afford to dispense with original sin, the author thinks, because there is enough left that is actual. This is scarcely a valid method of reasoning, but it seems to satisfy the author. The incarnation meant a divine human Christ. The atonement is the expression of God's love. The Holy Spirit dwells in all men, and is a continuous incarnation. The book is well written and thoughtful. The author, however, does not betray a profound acquaintance with views which conflict with his own. The book is interesting as the expression of the theology of a young man who has passed through a struggle. One cannot but wonder whether he will not feel constrained to modify some of his views as he matures in thought.

E. Y. MULLINS.

The Heart of the Gospel. A Popular Exposition of the Atonement.

By James M. Campbell. F. H. Revell Co., New York, Chicago, Toronto, London and Edinburg. Pages 234.

The style is popular; the chapters are short; the discussion is from the point of view of the author's preferences and philosophic leanings. The author cannot endure the thought of God's righteousness exacting anything for sin, and that God can exhibit wrath seems incredible. He reviews Lidgett, Dale, Moberly, McLeod, Campbell and others. He rejects the idea that the death of Christ was a ground for remission of sins. The altar imagery has lost its force, he maintains. Men are thinking "in biological terms". Paul's forensic view was a bridge for the Jews to pass to the inner and spiritual in Christianity. The sacrifice of Christ was the center of redemption. But the key to the atonement is the parable of the prodigal son. The barrier to be removed is on man's side and not on God's. "The primary object of the atonement is to reveal God's suffering love, so as to awaken repentance in man". This book adds little to what has already been said in the many books which advocate the same general type of theology. It is popular and readable in style, and for those who like this one-sided theology it will be welcome. E. Y. Mullins.

Christian Agnosticism as Related to Knowledge. The Critical Principle in Theology.

By E. H. Johnson, D.D., LL.D. Edited with biographical sketch and appreciation by Henry C. Vedder. Griffith & Rowland Press, Philadelphia, 1907. Pages 302. 90 cents, net, prepaid.

We may sum up the general position outlined in these pages in the following quotation: "Reason is free to build up her systems as well as she can, but reason should never stuff worn-out guesses into the broken windows of faith". This is the last work of the late lamented Prof. E. H Johnson, of Crozer Seminary. It is in his usual vigorous and terse style. The book was not quite finished, but all except the last two chapters had been put in readiness for the press, and the last two are made up of materials left by Dr. Johnson, and we are assured by Dr. Vedder that the contents represent only Dr. Johnson's

thought. A very appreciative biographical sketch by Dr. Vedder precedes the text. One rejoices to have this biography of the great teacher and theologian, and regrets that it is not longer. It is, however, comprehensive, and sets forth Dr. Johnson's character adequately, so far as can be done within the meagre limits of an introduction. The editor has done his work thoroughly well, as Dr. Vedder always does.

Dr. Johnson rejects the Kantian view, which disallows all reasoning about God except the practical. The spiritual is also real and knowable. The book is an effort to define the limits of the known and the knowable in theology, and in particular to expound the doctrine of the unknowable in theology. Protestantism has been guilty of unwarranted "cliff climbing". The aim here is to relieve theology of superfluities, to disburden it of those things which hinder its acceptance. The book discusses all the great fundamentals of theology from the standpoint adopted at the outset.

As to the will, the author holds that necessity and freedom are both true. "Ability to will in my own way is the fullest liberty". "Ability to will only in my own way is the strictest necessity. Necessity and freedom, therefore, are one". In the elaboration of this point Dr. Johnson is not quite clear, especially toward the conclusion. He seems to use agnosticism in a double sense. The reader is uncertain whether he means to conclude that he has actually solved the problem of necessity and freedom which he seems to assert, or whether, after all, he leaves the unknown element present. The latter seems to be the real view. If he really solves the difficulty, then agnosticism is unnecessary, and if the problem remains, there is no solution. Doubtless what he means is that we know without doubt the truth of freedom and without doubt the truth of necessity. Agnosticism remains as our attitude toward the ultimate problem.

He gives a very interesting discussion of life and its origin. The problem of creation is one of the most interesting. Dr. Johnson says the Monists attempt the impossible in their effort to show how mind and matter are one. Dualists have trouble enough, but escape this difficulty by refusing the at-

tempt. We do not know the relation between mind and matter. It is an ultimate problem. Creation out of nothing is an insoluble mystery. Yet the most indubitable element of our knowledge is God's existence. "That God created, means that he was; that He rules, means that he is. If we claim to know any truth of religion, this is the truth which we know best; but if any truth of religion is inexplicable, this is that truth."

The discussion of the Redeemer is suggestive and interesting. The doctrines of the eternal generation of the Son and of the procession of the Spirit are speculations and not revelations. The synoptists have no word as to Christ's prenatal relations to the Father, though they teach that he was divine. Paul and John both teach the pre-existence of Christ explicitly. Here Dr. Johnson makes a distinction which seems over-subtle. John, he asserts, does not affirm personality in the pre-existent Christ, though the Logos was, according to John, an individual. Just what he means by this distinction, he does not make clear, and it is a difficult one to grasp. It is difficult to accept this distinction on the basis of what seems a rather precarious exegesis. The application of agnosticism here seems not done well enough, or overdone. Either John meant Christ was a person, or we do not know what he meant.

Dr. Johnson well remarks that many theories of how the dead are raised exhibit bad tactics for Christians and provoke unanswerable objections from unbelief. The fact is sufficient.

One of the best chapters in the book is the last, entitled *The Modus Vivendi.* Faith knows that the essential facts of Paul's Gospel are true. Experience is the fruit and proof of their truth. Without the experience, they could not be believed, because the alleged cause would have no effect. Yet historical tradition confirms experience; a line of witnesses runs back to Christ. We may be agnostic, therefore as to insoluble questions of criticism, while perfectly clear as to the facts of Christianity.

The above is of course an exceedingly meagre outline. The book is one of the most valuable which has appeared in recent times on theological subjects. The agnostic principle is here made to do the highest service which it has ever been called

upon to render, yet it is handled by a sane thinker who knows the facts of faith as well as the theories of philosophy. The book is a striking example of adapting a principle of the adversary to the uses of faith, and illustrates how that every imposing and permanent element of human thought has its function in the realms of life and truth. The book will prove reassuring to many wavering believers. It will disarm many hostile critics. Agnosticism as here expounded is regarded by the author as the critical principle in theology, while the idea of law is the constructive principle. The book is destined to have a wide reading, and is eminently worthy of it.

E. Y. Mullins.

II. BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

A. GENERAL.

How to Master the English Bible.

By Rev. James M. Gray, D.D., author of "Synthetic Bible Studies," etc. Winona Pub. Co., Chicago, 1904. Cloth. Pages 84.

The high claim is made for the author of this book that his work has revolutionized the method of teaching in some Sunday Schools; put life into dead prayer-meetings; materially helped to solve the problem of the second service of the Lord's Day; proved a boon to many pastors in the labors of study and pulpit; contributed to the efficiency of many foreign missionary workers; and has reacted beneficially on the instruction given in the English Bible in some of our home academies, colleges and seminaries; and that the secret of the results is given in this little book. In a prefatory note by the publishers one pastor is quoted as saying: "I learned more during the few days I listened to Dr. Gray about the true character of preaching than I had learned in all my Seminary course and my twenty years of ministry." The publishers, therefore, are glad, they say, to give to the public this book which tells the story of the case, and "contains a practical application of all that the author has said and taught to the results which may be gathered from it in the pulpit." The book is really too good a thing to be embarrassed and discounted by such extravagance.

In part first the author significantly confesses that for the first eight or ten years of his ministry he did not know his English Bible as he should have known it; that he found only one or two brethren in the ministry who knew it better than he did; and that all declared that the theological seminaries did not profess to teach the English Bible; they taught much about the Bible, the Hebrew and the Greek, the principles of exegesis, the history of the text, etc., but seemed to assume that their students were acquainted with the English Bible, the great facts about it and their relation to one another, before matriculation. It was this unfortunate state of things, he says, that, in part, accounts for the rise and maintenance of such institutions as the Moody Bible Institute, and Spurgeon's College in London, with their almost countless offspring and imitators everywhere. Certainly there is more than a grain of truth in this statement of the case; and we may well rejoice that the wise founders of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary constituted it an exception to the rule, and made ample provision from the first for the study of the English Bible, as well as for the study of the Hebrew and the Greek, etc., and that since the day so vividly pictured by Dr. Gray. The lack justly complained of has been felt and remedied to some degree in a growing number of colleges and theological seminaries in this and other lands.

The author began by "ignoring the Bible tongues for the time" and reading Genesis through in English at a single reading; then repeating the process until the great outlines of the book became his. Then he took up Exodus in the same way, Leviticus, Numbers and ultimately all the books of the Old and the New Testaments. His "plan", in short was simply to read and reread each book in English, by itself and in its order, as though there were no other in existence, "until it had become a part of my very being". Who will deny the merit of such a plan? No wonder he gives a glowing account of the joy and power which resulted from it. When ministers thus come to know their Bible, he says with enthusiasm that is contagious, and get imbued with its love and anointed by the Spirit through whom it speaks, sermonizing will give place to preaching—the

preaching that God bids us to preach, the exposition of His Word, which is not only much easier to do, but correspondingly more fruitful in spiritual results. GEO. B. EAGER.

The Student's Bible. (King James Version, with Copious Readings from the American Revised Version) with marginal notes of an exhaustive topical analysis of all passages, citing explanatory foot notes with numerous subheadings and with references to all related Scriptures.

By Orville J. Nave, D.D., LL.D., and Anna Semans Nave, M.L.A. Topical Bible Publishing Co., Lincoln, Neb., 1907.

Chaplain Nave's Topical Bible is well known to Bible readers. In the present work he has produced what seems to the reviewer to be the most useful work of its kind in existence. It is a complete system of analysis and references in one handy volume. The unique feature is the fact that references to all Biblical passages bearing on a given subject are collected in a footnote at one point. This footnote refers to every passage bearing on the subject and every passage bearing on the subject refers to this footnote. Some eighty thousand subjects are thus treated and these subjects are gathered up in a valuable index at the end. The text is that of the King James version, but where the Revised and American versions differ materially their valuable readings are indicated in the margin, where there are other valuable notes. Every Bible student who wants to know the teaching of the book will find this work a most useful guide to its collected teachings. W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

The Bible as Good Reading.

By Senator Albert J. Beveridge. Henry Altemus Company, Publishers, Philadelphia. 1907. Cloth, 50 cents; Ooze calf, $1.00. Pages 94.

Think of a United States Senator writing a book on "The Bible as Good Reading"! But here it is, and right "good reading" it is itself. How did he come to write it? Well this he tells us in quite a lively way in the first chapter entitled "In the Big Woods". We are reminded of what we learn from another source, that the Senator from Indana was, in effect, brought up in a logging camp. He had a prodigious natural

appetite for reading, but out there in the woods there was nothing much to read save the Bible. Accordingly, the lad read the Bible through and through, and over and over; and he came at last, as he went on in life and had occasion to compare it with other books, to see that it was, considered strictly from the point of view of interesting reading, the very best book of all. This he undertook to prove to his companions at this later day, in "The Big Woods". When one of them craving "something to read" demurred to the suggestion contained in the question, "Well, what's the matter with the Bible?" "Why," man, said the other, "the Bible has more good reading in it than any book I know of. What will you have—poetry, adventure, politics, maxims, oratory? They are all here." Thus occurred the first Bible reading "in The Woods"; and after it was over, it was the demurrer who said: "Why, I never knew that was in the Bible. Let's have some more of that tomorrow." And on the morrow they did have more of it; and one of the guides was near and sat down and listened. The next day all of the guides were there. The day after the reading was for some cause delayed, and Indian Charley said: "Isn't it about time to have some more of that there Bible?" And is it a wonder, after all, that this continued day in and day out "through the long, but all too brief vacation in the woods—the real, deep woods; that even the guides found the old book full of keen, human interest; that it was no trouble even for them to understand Isaiah; that they had the same spirit that inspired David when he went up against Goliath; that they knew with their deep, elemental natures, the kind of woman Ruth was and Rebekah was; that Moses slaying the Egyptian and leading the children of Israel out of Egypt, even laying down the law in good, strict man-fashion, was entirely intelligible to them? Even the Sermon on the Mount, yea "Most of all", the author tells us, was taken in by these rude guides with apparent understanding and delight. What would the "Scholars" and "higher critics" say to this, he wonders.

How few of us after all, ever think of the Bible just as good reading? How many ever dream of comparing its stories

with the fiction we read, or its orations with the speeches we hear? Yet these are just the sort of comparisons Senator Beveridge makes to the immense advantage of the Bible, showing, in fact, that, considered merely from the point of view of interest, it is the monarch of all books. This he endeavors here to prove in a most vigorous and engaging way, in a style that evidently itself was largely formed from years of interested study of the Bible. The book is really a valuable, popular guide to the most interesting portions of the Bible; and whoever reads it will not only find entertainment, but will be quite sure to read his Bible, too, with a new zest.

GEO. B. EAGER.

B. OLD TESTAMENT.

The First and Second Books of the Maccabees. The Temple Bible Series.

By W. Fairweather, M. A., Philadelphia. J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1907. Price 40 cents.

Mr. Fairweather is thoroughly at home in the inter-biblical history and has done his part well in the introduction to the two books and the comments on the Maccabean period. It is a very interesting portion of Jewish history and throws much light on the New Testament history. A. T. ROBERTSON.

Grammatik der Septuaginta. Laut und Wortlehre.

Von Dr. Robert Helbing, Professor am Mädchengymnasium in Karlsruhe, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Goettingen, Germany, 1907. S. 149. To be had also through Lemcke and Buechner, New York.

This is a most welcome volume. The one on Syntax is eagerly awaited. The new discoveries in the papyri have not released us from the necessity of studying the Septuagint. The task is rather made more urgent and also more hopeful. We turn now to the Septuagint not merely for Hebraisms, but also for illustrations of the vernacular, *κοινή*. Dr. Helbing has performed his task with skill and in condensed form gives a good working apparatus. At last it is becoming possible to make intelligent use of the LXX in the study of the New Testament Greek. We have the Cambridge Text, Swete's Introduction to

the Old Testament in Greek, Hatch and Redpath's Concordance. We need a Lexicon of the LXX and Prof. Thackeray is at work on another Grammar of the LXX. But good luck to Dr. Helbing in his volume on Syntax.

A. T. Robertson.

The Book of Jeremiah.

By Charles Rufus Brown, D.D. American Baptist Publication Society, 1907. Pages 256.

The American Baptist Publication Society is pushing to completion as rapidly as possible its series entitled "An American Commentary on the Old Testament". Prof. Brown's commentary on Jeremiah is certainly one of the most important volumes in the series. The commentary is preceded by a valuable Introduction. A chronological chart covering the period from 638 B. C. to 30 B. C. gives much information about events in Judah, Babylonia, Egypt, Syria and other countries with which the Jews had political relations. Prof. Brown has inserted in this chart dates for the Israelitish literature as presented by Kautzsch in "The Literature of the Old Testament". We could wish that Prof. Brown had given us his own personal views concerning the dates of the Old Testament books.

The life and activity of Jeremiah are sketched with a firm hand. The author divides Jeremiah's life into four periods: First, his youth and earlier activity, from about 647 to 608 B. C. Second, his activity in the reigns of Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin, 607 to 597 B. C. Third, his work during Zedekiah's reign, 596 to 586. Fourth, his life subsequent to the deportation by Nebuchadrezzar, 585 to 575 (?) B. C. The author is inclined to look with favor upon the traditional view that Jeremiah was stoned to death by his unbelieving countrymen.

While frankly recognizing Jeremiah's inferiority to Isaiah in brilliancy of style and the measured flow of thought, Prof. Brown endorses without hesitation Prof. Driver's statement concerning Jeremiah that, "By his conception of the New 'Covenant' (31:31-34), he surpasses in spirituality and profundity of insight every other prophet of the Old Testament". This is claiming for Jeremiah all that his most ardent admir-

ers could wish, and it may be that the statement is put a little too strongly.

The author compares Jeremiah with Hosea, "the prophet of the decline and fall of the Northern kingdom". Both prophets have much to say of Israel's adulterous departure from her Divine husband. Jeremiah's complete subordination of all his personal life to his calling as a prophet receives proper emphasis. Dr. Brown shows that Jeremiah's tears were the expression of a deep nature. He well says: "There is no evidence whatever to suppose that he was naturally a weak man, or anything but joyous in temperament, and he could be as optimistic as the most hopeful when the facts warranted such an attitude." He adds: "The noblest Hebrew of the centuries could not live in Jerusalem at the time, and strive continually and unavailingly to open the eyes of the blind leaders of the blind, without disappointment, and so artless a soul must express his sorrow with freedom. In such a man we can note the manliness of tears."

Prof. Brown has made full use of recent commentaries and discussions concerning the poetry found in the writings of the prophets. In the special translation, printed along with the authorized version in the body of the commentary, Prof. Brown has given in poetical form those parts of the roll of Jeremiah which he regards as having real poetical measure. It is not always easy, as Prof. Brown recognizes, to distinguish between prose and poetry in elevated Hebrew oratory.

The roll of Jeremiah contains several valuable hints as to the manner in which our book received its present form. In chapter 36 we are told that Jeremiah dictated to his friend Baruch in 640 B. C. the substance of his oracles of the twenty-three preceding years. Prof. Brown thinks that the most of Jeremiah 1:1 to 9:22 was found in the roll which Jehoiakim burned in the fire. He conjectures that the larger roll, compiled in the following year, contained in addition chapters 11 to 17. From chapter 18 onward Prof. Brown thinks that we have other prophecies by Jeremiah in the period following 603 B. C. He is of the opinion that the book gradually grew until it included chapters 1 to 39, certain later interpolations

being excluded. Of course much of this additional material may have first appeared in smaller collections. He would find in chapters 27 to 29 one of these smaller collections, which probably had separate existence before being incorporated into our present roll. He leans to the view that these smaller collections were incorporated into the roll of Jeremiah gradually. He imagines that the roll may once have closed with chapter 25, and later on with chapter 36. His theory of the growth of the book of Jeremiah becomes considerably involved as he endeavors to sketch the insertion of various smaller sections, whose addition finally brought the roll to its present dimensions. He credits Baruch, Jeremiah's amanuensis and friend, with large parts of the book. He also thinks that other disciples of Jeremiah inserted and added many passages.

Dr. Brown gives an interesting chronological table for the composition of the various sections of Jeremiah. He also appends a valuable table of quotations in Jeremiah from earlier books of the Old Testament, and of repeated passages in Jeremiah.

Prof. Brown follows Duhm in his theory of the value of the Septuagint for tracing the history of the growth of the book of Jeremiah. The Greek arrangement of the book, as all Old Testament scholars know, differs very considerably from the order in the Hebrew manuscripts. A good many modern scholars prefer the Hebrew order as the most natural; but Dr. Brown agrees with Duhm in regarding the Septuagint order as the earlier one. His view of the growth of the roll of Jeremiah receives confirmation, he thinks, from a careful comparison of the Septuagint with the Hebrew text. He remarks: "The comparison is of great importance, however, as showing that in Jeremiah, as Duhm maintains, we have a people's religious book in which the prophet's language served as a thread on which were strung the edifying words of many generations of authors."

Dr. Brown's view as to the various authors who contributed to the formation of the present book of Jeremiah is thus expressed: "Nearly *one-half* of the book consists of sermons, more or less expanded from Jeremiah's utterances; a little more than

one-quarter was written by Baruch and others in the way of a history of the prophet, embodying a few of his words also, and the remaining *one-quarter* is made up for the most part of discourses by admirers of Jeremiah, and is based upon his own language and that of other prophets." He reminds us that Duhm, in his effort to be very exact, ascribes to Jeremiah *four-nineteenths* of the whole number of verses in the book, to Baruch *three-nineteenths,* and to unknown authors *twelve-nineteenths.* In making selections Duhm ascribes to Jeremiah's hand the poetic passages possessing the strongest marks of originality and prophetic foresight. The ordinary reader might fancy that Professors Duhm and Brown would reject as interpolations from half to twelve-nineteenths of our present book. To remove from himself the suspicion of thus destroying the value of a large part of the roll of Jeremiah, Dr. Brown remarks: "Indeed there is no biblical ground for maintaining Jeremiah's authorship of the book called by his name, the name simply designating Jeremiah as the principal figure among its characters; and, if it is considered worth while, one ought to be perfectly free to search for its authors by any known means of inquiry, just as we might in the case of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, regarded by the Jewish doctors very properly as belonging to the same class of books". In another paragraph Dr. Brown seeks to make his position plain to his readers: "From the present point of view it will be seen that, in the use of the terms *genuine* and *not genuine,* and in denying to Jeremiah the authorship of parts of our book, the writer must not be understood as questioning the *authority* of a given passage, or its value to the Christian life, although from a literary point of view it must be allowed that Jeremiah's own words are superior to those of the authors that have been associated with him." While Dr. Brown directs the reader's attention chiefly to the literary superiority of Jeremiah to the later authors and editors, who are supposed to have enlarged upon his work, the inevitable effect on the mind of the student would be to exalt the genuine passages to an authority and value far above that of the work of the later writers. One finds himself wishing that he might have precisely

the words that the great prophet Jeremiah spoke, all interpolations and modifications being entirely removed. The so-called later additions the reader almost inevitably comes to regard as having the value only of a commentary on the original text of Jeremiah. While not disposed to set aside as of no value these later insertions and modifications, the modern student would scarcely think of them as having the authority of the fresh, living words of a great, inspired prophet like Jeremiah. Of course such an objection to the conclusion reached by Prof. Brown would not in the least settle the question of the correctness of his views. This is properly a matter of evidence, and the reader ought to be willing to examine the facts carefully and fearlessly. The presence of Baruch's hand in the roll would not startle the most orthodox student, for we are expressly told that he acted as amanuensis to the prophet Jeremiah. Moreover, other pupils and admirers of the great prophet might well have possessed all the qualifications for writing down the story of his life. We have no definite information as to the manner in which Jeremiah's prophecies and the story of his experiences were finally put into their present form. We should welcome any light that sane and searching criticism can throw on the problem. The present reviewer must confess that the idea of interpolations in the prophetic messages of the prophet is quite displeasing. It may seem to be merely a matter of taste, and bold critics may laugh at his squeamishness, but he would honestly prefer, if the view of Duhm and others is correct, to disentangle every interpolation and other interference with Jeremiah's own speech and forever keep them separate from the genuine words of that noble prophet. Ten verses from the mouth of Jeremiah would outweigh a hundred from the pens of later editors and commentators.

Prof. Brown brings forward an excellent bibliography on Jeremiah. Nothing of real value on the book seems to have escaped his careful eye. For the convenience of the student, a full table of contents is prefixed to the commentary. The reader can at a glance discover the author's view as to the authorship and date of any passage in the roll of Jeremiah.

We have not space in which to call attention to the author's comments on the many interesting passages in the book of Jeremiah. With much of this we find ourselves in hearty agreement, and everywhere there is evidence of careful first-hand study of the original text and wide use of the best critical literature on the book. An Old Testament scholar would naturally turn first of all to the comment on Jer. 7:21-23. Recent radical critics have contended that Jeremiah meant to say that Jehovah gave no commands to Moses concerning burnt-offerings and sacrifices. His one revelation at the time of the Exodus, according to Jeremiah, was moral and spiritual. According to the divisive critics, the representation of the middle books of the Pentateuch that Jehovah gave to Moses and Aaron many precepts concerning sacrifices, was the work of late authors, and Jeremiah held quite a different view concerning the origin and value of sacrificial rites. In commenting on the 22d verse Prof. Brown says: "Until very recently commentators have sought to evade the natural meaning of this verse by strained interpretations. On the one hand it has been explained as a rhetorical statement, expressing not an absolute antithesis, but a relative one. According to this Jehovah would be made to say, 'I have not so much given you commands in respect to sacrifice, as rather enjoined something else upon you'." Prof. Brown accepts Jeremiah's statement literally as an absolute antithesis: "Sacrifices did not originate at Sinai and were not there commanded. In. Deut., chaps. 12 to 26 (cf. Exod. 23:14-19), sacrifices are indeed enjoined, but in a way consistent with the hypothesis that they are inheritances from the past, and that only the conditions of their presentation are to be regulated. It is possible that even the minute prescriptions of the priestly parts of the Pentateuch may be understood in this way." But the priestly parts of the Pentateuch distinctly represent Jehovah as giving specific directions and commands to Moses and Aaron with regard to the sacrificial system. Moreover, the moral and spiritual requirements emphasized in the 23d verse had also been anticipated in the promises and commands to the patriarchs. "Attention to the divine voice and a life in har-

mony with his will" received much emphasis prior to the Exodus from Egypt. Loyalty to Jehovah was not a thing first promulgated at Sinai. As this passage is a fine example of the figure of exaggerated contrast, the reviewer has prepared a brief article on this subject for publication in the present issue of the Review and Expositor, to which the reader is referred for a discussion of Jer. 7:21-23 in the light of parallel passages.

In closing his discussion of Jeremiah's words concerning the sacrificial system, Dr. Brown says: "It is scarcely necessary to add that in the interpretation of vers. 21-23, the present writer has left untouched the question of the Mosaic institution of the pentateuchal legislation." Our author has by his lapse into literalism placed Jeremiah in direct contradiction with the representations in the middle books of the Pentateuch. The plain reader will be at a loss what to do. Shall he cease to believe the statements in the Pentateuch about the different directions as to the various sacrifices? or shall he charge Jeremiah with a misunderstanding of the facts? The dilemma in which the reader finds himself is a serious one, and it is only by an exceedingly "strained" interpretation that the minute prescriptions of the priestly parts of the Pentateuch may be understood as inheritances from the past, only the conditions of their presentation being regulated. The question of the Mosaic institution of the Pentateuchal legislation is not as fundamental and important as the question of the *Divine* institution of that legislation.

John R. Sampey.

Israel: or Jacobs' New Name. A Study.

By Edward Payson Vining. America Printing Co., Boston, 1908.

While engaged in the careful study of the exact meaning of Jacob's new name, Mr. Vining made some unexpected discoveries of such importance that it seemed to him desirable to make them known. He came to the conclusion that the plain and simple meaning of the name Israel is "God Commands", or "Let God Command". Further investigation of the use of the verb which he renders "command" and other

related verbs put in his possession a goodly number of facts which oppose the current radical view of the composition of the Pentateuch. So far as the facts thus brought together can be used as a touchstone, they favor an early date for the book of Genesis. The author has made a careful study of the usage in cognate languages in order to fortify his conclusions as to the exact meaning of the Hebrew words which he discusses. The explanation of the name Israel in Genesis 32:28, according to the rendering in the American Revision, is "for thou hast striven with God and with men, and hast prevailed". Mr. Vining would render it: "For thou hast commanded with God and with men; and hast been able". He regards the name Israel ("God commands") as a constant reminder to Jacob that he must no longer assume the position of commander, and as such try to dictate to God. Mr. Vining has brought forward much valuable material in confirmation of his view.

The last four chapters of the book are devoted to the careful study of the meaning of II Samuel 12:31. Mr. Vining would translate the first part of this verse: "And the populace which was therein he brought forth and set in order with the stone-saw, and with pointed tools of iron, and with cold-chisels of iron; and he caused them to migrate, with their king." He thinks that the early Jewish scholars and translators in their effort to magnify the former importance of their people and the greatness of their sovereign, invented for him the glory of sawing his captives asunder and driving threshing-sledges around over them. To be sure, David's conduct at this period of life was wholly unworthy of a theocratic king, but Mr. Vining believes that a wrong translation has done serious injustice to David.

The author is quite original in his method of putting things, and has made a contribution to Hebrew exegesis that is worthy of the careful examination of Old Testament scholars. We hope that he may continue his researches in this field.

John R. Sampey.

The Minor Prophets.

By Frederick Carl Eiselen. Eaton & Mains, New York, 1907. Octavo. Pages 741.

Prof. Eiselen's book is volume IX, in a Commentary on the Old Testament put forth by the Methodist publishing house of Eaton & Mains. The author is a competent Old Testament scholar with a judicial mind. While thoroughly acquainted with the newest theories of the most advanced students, Professor Eiselen is not swept off his feet by any modern consensus of critics. He is also quite at home with the best commentaries produced by evangelical scholars in all ages and countries. He is not the paid attorney of any coterie or school, but rather an open-eyed investigator earnestly seeking to discover and propagate the truth. His spirit is thoroughly irenic. He is careful to state varying views with clearness and sympathy. Even when he decides against one's own personal view, the reader must acknowledge that the author has been courteous and fair. No doubt in the end he will win more adherents to his own personal conclusions by reason of his justice and fairness.

Prof. Eiselen prefixes to each of the twelve minor prophets an introduction dealing with such general questions as date and authorship, the integrity of the writing, summary of the teaching of the book, etc. The special problems peculiar to some of the books receive adequate treatment. As a rule commentaries are rather dry reading; but Professor Eiselen has given us a book quite easy to read. His meaning is always plain, and the reader's interest never flags.

Our author's position as to questions in debate among scholars as to the date of certain books may be of interest to the reader. Professor Eiselen thinks that Hosea's activity ceased about 735 B. C. He would place Joel shortly after the time of Nehemiah, perhaps about 400 B. C. The activity of Amos he would locate about 760 to 755 B. C., in agreement with most modern scholars. The most probable date for Obadiah, according to our author, would seem to be the period immediately following 586 B. C. The composition of the Book of Jonah he would place somewhere between 450 and 200 B. C.

Professor Eiselen defends the Book of Micah against the attacks of the more radical scholars, who allow to Micah only 1:2—2:11; 3:1-12. He seems inclined to agree with George Adam Smith in calling chapter 7:7-20 "a canto of several fragments, from periods far apart in the history of Israel". The earliest possible date for the prophecy of Nahum is 663 B. C., and Nineveh, whose destruction it foretold, fell in 607-606 B. C. Our author would locate this prophecy during the years immediately preceding the final overthrow of the city. He is inclined to put Habakkuk shortly before 600 B. C. The arguments against the genuineness of the prayer of Habakkuk seem to our author inconclusive. Professor Eiselen thinks that Zechariah 9—14 emanated from some prophet or prophets other than Zechariah the contemporary of Haggai. Chapters 9—11 he would assign to a date not earlier than 350 B. C. Whether chapters 12—14 come from the author of chapters 9—11 or from another post-exilic prophet, he leaves an open question. As to Malachi, Professor Eiselen hesitates as between 432 B. C. and a date prior to 458 B. C.

As to some questions of authorship, genuineness of detached passages, etc., the present reviewer is unable to accept Professor Eiselen's conclusions, but with the author's spirit and scholarship he has no fault to find. To pastors and Sunday school teachers the book will be immensely helpful in the study of the much neglected books of the minor prophets.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Christ in the Old Testament. Being short readings on some Messianic passages.

By B. W. Randolph, D.D. Longmans, Green & Co., New York., 1907. Crown Octavo. Pages 216.

The Bishop of Salisbury contributes a brief introduction commending the book for its loyalty and its practical value. Dr. Randolph selects a number of the most important Messianic passages in the Old Testament, and then goes on to show the application of the Old Testament prophecies to our Lord Jesus Christ. The emphasis of the book is placed upon the spiritual edification of the believer, rather than upon scien-

tific exegesis of the Old Testament passages in the light of their context. He does not hesitate to apply to our Lord Jesus Christ any Scripture that is so applied in the New Testament. Referring to the story of Philip and the eunuch, the author calls attention to the fact that in the early days of the church every Christian, and most of all every converted Jew, would see in the 53d chapter of Isaiah a picture of the sufferings, death and triumph of the Christ. He then adds the following remark: "But if we imagine some modern destructive critic sitting in the chariot with the Ethiopian instead of St. Philip, we sometimes find ourselves wondering when the distinguished Treasurer of Queen Candace would have heard the name of Jesus Christ". Dr. Randolph, while repudiating a mere mechanical conception of inspiration and prophecy, seeks to avoid the opposite extreme of emptying the Old Testament Scripture of all real predictions of the Christ.

In mechanical execution the volume is worthy of the excellent publishing firm of Longmans, Green & Co.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Books for Old Testament Study. An annotated list for popular and professional use.

By John Merlin Powis Smith. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1908. Postpaid, 54 cents. Pages 70.

Dr. Smith is an able representative of the Radical School of Old Testament scholars, of which Kuenen in Holland and Wellhausen in Germany have been the foremost leaders. The work of the members of this school, such as Stade, Cornill, Cheyne, Toy, H. P. Smith, Duhm, Marti, etc., receives the highest commendation. A good deal of faint praise is bestowed upon the representatives of the Mediating School, their scholarship receiving due recognition, but their fondness for retaining as much as possible of their inherited views receiving due castigation. Most representatives of the Conservative School may thank their stars if they escape with the skin of their teeth. If the student who uses this list only knows in advance the theological and philosophical presuppositions of the author, he can use this booklet with profit. He should bear

in mind, however, that he is consulting the brief of a very able attorney for the so-called progressive criticism. We have found a careful perusal of the lists exceedingly interesting. In discussing commentaries on the Psalter, the author has this to say of that masterful interpreter of Scripture, who has done so much to illumine the Psalms for the modern preacher: "Maclaren is wholly homiletical and traditional." We should like to say in this connection that the busy pastor, if he happens to have access to this list, would do well to purchase those books which fall under the author's displeasure as "traditional", "timid", and "conservative".

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Speakers for God. Being plain lectures on the Minor Prophets.

By Rev. Thomas McWilliam, M. A. Eaton & Mains, New York, 1907. $1.00 net. Pages 356.

Mr. McWilliam is minister of New Byth, Aberdeenshire. He has attempted in a series of lectures to present the mission and message of the twelve minor prophets in the light of recent scientific criticism. He follows in the main such writers as W. R. Smith, George Adam Smith and Cornill. He places after Malachi the book of Joel, Zechariah 9—14, and Jonah. He follows the general trend of the writers whom he takes as his guides in calling in question the genuineness of all passages whose historical setting cannot be fully recovered. He has a keen appreciation of the work of the prophets on behalf of civic righteousness. The moral and spiritual teaching of these ancient writers is set forth with clearness and force. It is not necessary that one should follow the author in his critical theories in order to gain stimulus and suggestion for the public exposition of the prophetic Scriptures.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

C. NEW TESTAMENT.

Canon and Text of the New Testament.

By Casper René Gregory. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Price $2.50 net. Pages 539.

Here at last is a vital and masterly work on the Canon of the New Testament by an American, one who has been pronounced the foremost of American Biblical scholars, and one

of the greatest living New Testament scholars. Professor Gregory accords to the late Bishop Westcott the credit of having produced "the best book ever written on the canon"; but it is likely now that this shining distinction will be transferred to the author of this later and completer work. This review deals with the work only so far as it has to do with the canon. As was to be expected, the fruits of the widest learning and maturest thought are to be found here in richest abundance, but, what will mean more to many a reader, it is all served up in so fresh and vivid and untechnical a style as to make it fairly fascinating and refreshing. Professor Gregory is singularly happy in getting at the large human interests that underlie the story of the formation of the canon, and in illustrating ancient facts and forces by modern parallels. For this and other reasons the old story becomes new under his touch, and as a result there is not a page of it that will not be read with interest and even avidity by one familiar with the story as it is usually told, and, indeed, by every person of inquiring mind who is concerned to see brought out into the clear the thrilling facts of the origin and history of the New Testament. Convinced that the old way of putting and approaching the question is not the right way, he justifies and adopts a new way. His first aim is not the history of the canon, but the criticism of the canon. He conceives, not unreasonably, that a scholar today should be able to gain a truer and more complete view of the circumstances of that early time, as well as greater clearness and depth of insight into the mental movements of the period than a Christian scholar of that very time could have secured. The current assumption that the canon is there almost from the first, that the books of the New Testament can scarcely be conceived of as all in existence for any appreciable space of time before the swift arm of ecclesiastical power gathered them from the four winds of heaven and sealed them in the official volume, he casts aside as pure fiction. Indeed, he does not, like most writers, assume that an unalterable collection of books—"The Canon"—existed then, or exists now; but he sets about in true scientific fashion to explore the evidence both for early existence of the writings

most highly valued by Christians, for both private and public use, and for the gradual classification of them as "canonical", *i. e.*, normative or standard works, acquiring at last "Scriptural" authority. Available evidence is manifold, but it is unequally distributed through six periods—from 30 to 700 A. D. It is in the second, or post-apostolic period, that these writings are first found passing from a common to a sacred use. But even Augustine, in the fifth century, after the Council of Carthage, staunch churchman that he is, dares to say that he regards the number of the books in the New Testament not yet settled. It is still, at that late day, a question whether this or that book belongs to the fully authoritative New Testament, *i. e.*, there is yet no canon in the technical sense of the word. One result of the searching investigation of the author is the conclusion that at no period in the history of Christianity did the necessity make itself apparent to the whole church to say just what was and just what was not "Scripture". As to any general council of the church "determining" the books which belong to the New Testament, there never was one. Now and then a local or partial council ratified the statement of some preceding church writer—that was all. The Christian churches of Europe and America suppose that we have a New Testament that consists in all parts of the world of the same books, but that supposition is the result of a half-unconscious process of closing the eyes to the testimony of history. The Reformers at first showed a freedom in dealing with this question which augured progress. But Rome and her offshoots, alarmed, sought for decisions. So the Council of Trent, April 8, 1546, was the first to make the question of the canon a matter of faith. Strange to say the churches of the Reformation, though declaring that the free spirit of the Christian recognized the genuine work of the Divine Spirit in these holy books and their use, were not content to leave the books to care for themselves. So, following the lead of Rome, they declared the whole New Testament for undoubted Scripture. From that day to this the questionings of the authenticity of one of the New Testament books has called forth anathema.

"We see by turning back the pages of the years," says the author in conclusion, "that God simply did not, in the way supposed, have the books collected. We say: Man proposes, God disposes. We might here say: Man imagines, God did. I believe that God watched over every step in the paths of the early Christians, but he had no thought of this (modern) theory of inspiration and of the canon. If any one then be inclined to say that this puts an end to all faith in the Scriptures, he may reassure himself with the reflection that when God makes nuts, the point is not the shell of the nut, but the kernel. If God sends the truth to men, the thing that he cares for, the thing that His Spirit watches over, is the truth". "The great thing for us is, not to become excited about diverging views as to a canon, but to take the truth and live in the truth, and *live the truth* and impart it in its purity to others." Certainly to that we can all say amen!

GEO. B. EAGER.

The Canon and Text of the New Testament.

By Casper Renè Gregory. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1907. Pages 539.

I shall treat only of the second part of the volume, the Text. The book belongs to the International Theological Library, a really great series. There is no living scholar better qualified about the text of the New Testament than Dr. Gregory, of Leipzig. This Prolegomena (1894) to Tischendorf's *Novum Testamentum* is a noble performance and indispensable to the student of New Testament textual criticism. This was followed by Text Kritik des Neuen Testamentes (2 vols., 1900 and 1902). The discussion now before us is popular in form, but thoroughly scholarly in method and spirit. Dr. Gregory is a strong exponent of the type of text presented by Westcott and Hort. He admits modifications in the light of new discoveries, but holds to the essential correctness of Westcott and Hort's theory of the text. I am in full accord with this position myself and teach it. It is a distinct pleasure to have the facts and the theory of textual criticism put in such a form that any intelligent reader can understand them. He gives so many interesting

items and makes so many pertinent remarks that cut into the heart of things that the most technical student will also find interest and help. It is distinctly a readable book on a very abstract theme. Dr. Gregory prefers the term "Re-wrought" Text for Western, "Polished Text" for Alexandrian. The neutral he merely merges into the Original Text, and the Syrian Revisions take the place of Syrian Text. These are all improvements in the terminology, but time alone can tell of their acceptance. He looks askance at the work of Von Soden on the New Testament text since he seems to be oblivious of Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort. That is indeed a serious fault.

A. T. Robertson.

A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.

Edited by James Hastings, D.D., with the assistance of John A. Selbie, D.D., and John C. Lambert, D.D. Volume II. Labour-Zirn with appendix and indexes. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1908. Price $6.00. Pages 912.

With this volume Dr. Hastings completes his unique undertaking, that of producing a cyclopedia about Christ and the gospels. He recognizes that the dictionary cannot be really adequate from the nature of the case, and yet these two volumes become indispensable to the studious minister of Christ. I cannot claim as yet to have read all the articles in this volume. The book is not to be read that way. I have enjoyed turning about in it and reading some of the articles that most attracted me. In the discussion of the Language of Christ Rev. James Young properly holds that Jesus used both Greek and Aramaic, though the bulk of his teaching was probably in Aramaic. Drs. Lambert and Stone divide the treatment of the Lord's Prayer. The Gospel of Luke is handled ably by Dr. A. Wright, of Queen's College, Cambridge, while Dr. A. Souter, of Mansfield College, Oxford, has Luke's life. So Dr. Rae writes on Mark and Dr. Maclean on the Gospel of Mark. Dr. W. C. Allen is naturally the man for the Gospel of Matthew. Dr. James Denny is at his best on Preaching Christ and Dr. J. H. Farmer on Pre-eminence. Reconciliation and Redemption have fallen into good hands, those of Dr. James Orr. The same thing is true of the important article on Res-

urrection of Christ by W. J. Sparrow-Simpson. Dr. Jas. Stalker is ideal for the Son of God. The articles in the Appendix are as good as any in the volume and in particular Dr. Sanday's Paul. Fortunately these two volumes are not beyond the reach of most of those who need them and ought to be greatly useful. A. T. Robertson.

The Gospel History and its Transmission.

By F. Crawford Burkitt, M.A., D.D., Hulsean, Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. Second Edition. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1907. Pages 366.

Dr. Burkitt has produced a very able and suggestive book. He has shown much independence in his method of treatment and is thoroughly free in his criticism as he ought to be, so far as that goes. He holds by what he calls a real historical kernel in the life and teachings of Jesus, but does not think that the Four Gospels, as we know them, can be used as history in the modern sense. I think Dr. Burkitt is too severe in the conditions that he lays down in the criticism of the Gospels. He points too narrow a basis in making Mark the criterion for judging the rest, that is Mark and the other source commonly called Q. It is in my judgment gratuitous to assume that Mark wrote down all that he knew and believed about Jesus or all that was there. Nor do we have the right to rule out as unhistorical what is not in Mark or in Matthew and Luke both (Q). Certainly more than two men wrote of Jesus (Luke says "many"), and certainly again many more knew much about what he had done and said. One of the difficulties of our criticism is that we impose arbitrary and even artificial limitations upon documents and demand that they come up (or down) to their criteria.

I must demur also to the confidence with which Dr. Burkitt dates Luke's writings at the close of the first century. It is by no means clear that Luke used Josephus. He is elsewhere a careful historian, as credible as Josephus, and Theudas is too common a name to trip Luke on. If he had used Josephus, he would hardly have Lysanias and Theudas in so different a connection. To my mind the argument goes just the other way to show that Luke did not use Josephus.

Dr. Burkitt demands also that a place be found in Mark's Gospel for the raising of Lazarus before that event can be credible. This is a curious alternative unless one is to assume that Mark knew everything about Jesus and also that he told all that he knew. Other reasons beside ignorance can be suggested for Mark's not telling the raising of Lazarus such as the brevity of his Gospel, the fact that Lazarus may still have been alive and the desire to shield him from the known purpose of the Sanhedrin to kill Lazarus. I think we need to test our criticism as severely as we do the Gospels themselves. But Dr. Burkitt keeps one awake and writes with vigor and clearness. A. T. Robertson.

Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus.

By Alfred E. Garvie, M.A., D.D., Principal of New College, London. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 1907. Pages 543.

Dr. Garvie is one of the ablest British theologians. He is a Congregationalist and the Principal of New College, one of the leading Congregational theological schools. He is a thorough scholar and a patient worker with a distinct philosophical turn of mind. In this book we have his *Magnum Opus* and it is worthy of him and of the great theme.

The book is not devotional as that term is usually understood though there are devotional passages here and there. The work of Dr. Garvie is distinctly critical and severely scientific in method and spirit. He does not hesitate to put everything in the crucible of argument nor can one complain of that. On the whole and in the greatest things the author holds by the fundamental evengelical faith. He argues well for the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, and the real Divinity of Jesus. Principal Garvie is a man of real spiritual force as well as great mental grasp and his heart beats true all through the book.

Many critical questions confront us in this really great book and one cannot expect to find agreement on them all. I would myself put many things very differently as, for instance, the Fourth Gospel, which Dr. Garvie considers by an eye-witness, but not by John the Son of Zebedee (p. 29). He assigns it to the Presbyter John (p. 32). I will not here attempt to criti-

cise these points of detail. I much prefer to accent the candor and sincerity which the book displays at every turn, the evident desire to get at the truth. The author, like all other men, is under the influence of his philosophy in his interpretation of Christ, and does not hesitate to challenge at times the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel as in Jo. 2:19. Instead of taking this as a crisp parable of the destruction of the body of Jesus in terms of the temple, expressly said to be not understood at the time, Dr. Garvie prefers (p. 173) to put his own interpretation into the words, viz., "a spiritual restoration in a very short time".

But this is a serious and earnest work and will repay careful study. The style is heavy, but the thought is strong and the words are all well weighed.

A. T. Robertson.

Studies in the Life of Christ.

By J. B. Shearer, D.D., LL.D. Professor of Biblical Instruction, Davidson College, Richmond, Virginia. Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1907. Cloth. Pages 172.

This does not purport to be a new Life of Christ. Dr. Shearer's aim is rather to make a wide and exhaustive induction of the facts, in the Gospels and elsewhere in the Scriptures, which throw light on the person, character and work of Christ.

Here are the chapter titles: The State of the World at the Christian Era; the Fulness of Time; Who is the Lord? Who is Christ; His Names and Titles; Christ's Prayer; Christ's Controversies; Parables; Miracles; Typology; Prophecies Fulfilled in Christ; Christ's Prophecies; The Parousia or the Coming; Four Last Days of Christ's Public Ministry; The Passover, The Lord's Supper, the Betrayal; The Trial; The Crucifixion; The Resurrection and Ascension; The Overlapping of the Dispensations; Summary of the Gospel of Christ.

Our main criticism is that the perspective is not as good as it might be. Should we not expect in that last one chapter, at least, devoted to the Kingdom and Jesus' teaching respecting it as throwing light on His own character and spirit. Indeed the chief failure of the book is just there. It is too ex-

ternal and official and does not reveal sufficiently the principles and spirit of Jesus.

On the other hand it has many good features. There is valuable constructive work here. There are truths wrought out that are now-a-days commonly overlooked. Many striking things are said. Some of these one would agree with, e. g., the identifying of Christ with Jehovah; the explanation of the "three days and three nights" in the grave. With others one would disagree, e. g., the idea that the "parousia" refers wholly to Christ's present administration through the Spirit, and the meaning of the "cup" in Gethsemane. On the whole we commend the volume as calculated to give an enlarged and truer conception of our glorious Lord. J. H. FARMER.

The Lord of Glory. A study of the designations of our Lord in the New Testament, with especial Reference to His Deity.

By Benjamin B. Warfield, Professor in Princeton Theologica, Seminary. American Tract Society, New York, 1907. Price, $1.50 netl Pages 332.

Dr. Warfield has made an exhaustive study of his subject as one would expect. He brings before us the entire New Testament field. His plan has the advantage of a certain amount of repetition and monotony as the various books pass under review. But after all that is probably inevitable in such a discussion. There is no monotony in the style, but freshness of view and vigor of statement throughout. More than half of the volume (173 pages) is devoted to the Synoptic Gospels. This is well in view of modern attacks on John and Paul as giving a "theological" rather than the historical Christ. He begins with Mark and finds in the primitive the same fundamental conceptions of the deity of Jesus that meet us later in John and Paul. This is undoubtedly the strongest part of the argument. The entire Synoptic picture is set before us and it is impossible to find here a merely human Jesus. Possibly Dr. Warfield is a little too unwilling to admit a development in the use of the terms as the disciples came more fully to apprehend Jesus. But he is wholly right in his basal contention. One of the best things

in the book is the minute discussion of each of the terms used of Jesus. One will find the work a handy place to turn to for data on this subject. The book is not a discussion of the whole question of the deity of Jesus, but only of this one aspect. This it does thoroughly.

A. T. Robertson.

The Man of Galilee. A new enquiry.

By George R. Wendling. Olcott Publishing Co., Washington, D. C., 1907. Pages 270.

Mr. Wendling has a series of very able, popular lectures which he has delivered to enthusiastic audiences all over the country. One need not doubt that much good has been done to the cause of religion and morality by these addresses. He is now publishing seven of them under the title of Modern Doubt Series. They treat some of the central questions of faith. The present volume is the most important of the series. Mr. Wendling comes at the problem of Jesus not from the standpoint of a technical theologian, but from that of a cultured publicist who has read widely the criticisms of sceptics and has done his own thinking. His treatment is therefore independent and fresh rather than exhaustive. He follows large general lines of thinking which form a fine groove for the mind of the modern man. I suspect that many a busy man of to-day who has been thrown into doubt by the noise of present-day sceptics will find a way out into the open by means of Mr. Wendling's address which is here published in expanded form. It has all the elements of Mr. Wendling's characteristic style and is readable clear through.

A. T. Robertson.

The Teaching of Jesus Concerning His Own Person.

By Wayland Hoyt, LL.D. American Tract Society, New York, 1907. Price, 75 cents. Pages 199.

Dr. Hoyt writes with enthusiasm on this noble theme and with admirable good sense. He is alert and sane and skilfully puts the various aspects of the problem in a way to help the young readers whom he has in mind. But older minds will

find food for thought here too. Dr. Hoyt has read widely and makes good use of his reading in his discussion. He has the style of the eloquent preacher that he is and has richness of suggestion at every turn. The volume belongs to Dr. Kerr's Series on the Teachings of Jesus which now lacks only one book of completion. A. T. Robertson.

The Parables.

Edited by Rev. Lyman Abbott, D.D.D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1907. Pages 193.

There is a brief and interesting introduction by Dr. Abbott, but the bulk of the volume is devoted to the printing of the text with beautiful decorations by Arthur Jacobson. There are also a number of modern illustrations of the parables by Arthur E. Becher. The book is handsomely bound. The total result is a delightful volume that sets in aesthetic beauty the matchless stories of the Master. In nothing does the teaching of Jesus surpass that of all other men more than in his wondrous parables. They are made more attractive, if possible, by this volume. A. T. Robertson.

L'Evangile. (Synopse, Vie de Notre Seigneur. Commentaire.)

Par Abbè Verdunoy. 1 vol. in-12, 400p., avec 1 carte et 2 plans; Lecoffre, Paris, 1907. 3 fr. 50.
(Abbe Verdunoy is the Superior of the Petit Seminaire of Dijon, France.)

It is not his first appearance in print, but it is the first work of his of any particular interest to Biblical scholars. Not that he is a novice in this realm. This book gives evidence of long and patient labor, and is soon to be followed by two others that should prove equally interesting, one in two volumes, entitled "L'Eglise Apostolique" translating and commenting on the rest of the New Testament, the other "Scenes Evangeliques".

The author's aim is "to teach Christians to read the gospel; to enable them to relish and live over again its unique pages, and to that end to show the real bond of union between these fragmentary records, and throw light on the obscure part of

a book written nineteen centuries ago by men of an epoch, race and country very different from our own". There are thirty pages of general introduction. There are many interesting things in these pages. Inspiration is defined thus: "A supernatural help which leads someone to write and enables him to find what he ought to write." "There are two agents", he adds. "God, man; the divine action is efficacious, not necessitating."

The Gospels, he regards as "not stenographic report nor some notes taken from day to day, but a part of the apostolic tradition." Protestants are therefore wrong, he says in accepting only these fragments and rejecting the tradition which is more complete and more important than the Gospel. His summary of the synoptic problem is this: "There was an oral catechism which was repeated sometimes in the same, sometimes in different terms. The first written collection preserved both resemblances and differences which afterwards passed into our Gospels. We must abandon the old harmonistic methods of reconciling divergent accounts and cease demanding of the evangelists a minute accuracy in details which was entirely foreign to the literary habits of the time."

The purpose of each gospel is briefly stated. Matthew wrote of the admission to the Gentiles into the church to answer the question which so troubled Jewish Christians, namely: if Jesus was the Messiah, why was he not recognized by his compatriots? Mark's aim was to show Roman converts from paganism that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. Luke writes primarily to enlighten the faith of Theophilus, but secondarily only for all the faithful. His distinctive note is that the Gospel consists in a salvation won for all men by the death of the Messiah and by personal repentance. John has a twofold purpose—to convince his readers that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and to lead them to express this conviction in their actions, to transform it into "life". Their historicity is not questioned.

The life of Jesus is divided into three parts—the birth and early years; the public life (sub-divided, naturally) and the "glorious" (resurrection) life. The opening pages present the

material in tabular harmonies to form with 190 sections as compared with 143 in Broadus. Four passovers are noted. A second table is added of ready reference for each gospel to section and page. An index of important subjects is given at the back, and in the body of the work are two maps and two plans of the temple.

In the Commentary he takes up the harmonistic sections one after another. John 1-11, however, is treated by itself, forming sections 104 to 129. The text, in the author's own translation from the Greek, is first given complete in small print, and then follows the commentary in more readable type.

The general standpoint is that of orthodox Catholicism. This gives it a value of its own. Take the attitude of tradition, for example. That leaves freedom for both the higher and the lower criticism. The author actually departs from the infallible Vulgate text in favor of the Vatican or the other early manuscripts. And we have already seen that divergent accounts cause him no anxiety, for where they fail he has tradition to fall back upon. And really, as one ever and anon comes upon the estimate of tradition here held, he is led to wonder whether after all modern criticism would not do well to pay more heed to the united voice of the early centuries, as in counterpoise of the spirit of undue subjectism that reigns in some quarters.

There are many observations in the body of the Commentary and in the numerous foot-notes that are interesting and suggestive for the English reader. French vivacity and a delicious naïvete are constantly in evidence. It is especially refreshing to see how the good Abbe, in expounding Christ's rebukes of the Pharisees emphasizes the futility and danger of outer ritual "if the heart be not right".

The book is positive and confirmatory of the historicity of the Gospels, and is really much better and nearer the mark than those that give the impression that they are generally unreliable. Of the latter we have a superabundant supply.

J. H. Farmer.

Paul, the Mystic. A study in Apostolic Experience.

By James M. Campbell, D.D. Andrew Melrose, 16 Pilgrim street, London, England, 1907. Price, 4s. 6d. Pages 284.

I am sure that many will be helped by reading this book, not so much by the inherent novelty of the ideas, as by the truthful portrayal of the great Apostle's spirit that we here meet. The writer has a terse style and many of his sentences are well balanced and he has neat turns in abundance. It is no novice who is unfolding to us the mind of Paul. There is a revival of interest in mysticism even in its technical aspects and Dr. Campbell does much to put the true conception of mysticism before his readers. But his real work lies in the emphasis laid on the fact that Paul's mysticism was so sane, so practical, so vital. Those who think of Paul as the theologian chiefly or even as the missionary will derive distinct help from this strong accent upon his mystical side. He treats Paul as a religious mystic, a Christian mystic, an evangelical mystic, a practical mystic. The fertility of Paul is well illustrated by the number of books necessary to set forth the variety of his nature. Dr. Campbell has done well to single out this side of Paul's life. It was indeed the heart of the man, his mystic union with Christ. All else was subordinate to this, the possession of his soul, to live in Christ, to let Christ live in him.

A. T. Robertson.

Die sittlichen Weisungen Jesu. Ihr Missbrauch und ihr richtiger Gebrauch.

Von Dr. W. Herrmann, Professor an der Universität Marburg. Zweite verbesserte Auflage. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1907. Price, 1 mark.

In this booklet of seventy-two pages, the outgrowth from an address given in 1903, Professor Herrman sets forth the wrong and right ways to regard and use the moral precepts of Jesus in such fashion that it is adapted to meet many needs. While there are defects in it, as the attributing to Jesus of an expectation that the world would immediately end, yet its great merits by far overweigh its defects. That Jesus did not come as a lawgiver to give new precepts of righteousness but

to demand and impart a new temper, that this temper is love without limit, that this temper of love will in new circumstances find new duties, that Tolstoi, for example, is in error in applying sayings of Jesus to our present relations as citizens, for which they were not spoken—all this is said so forcibly and well as to deserve what a German reviewer said, "Herrman's Grundgedanken sollten jedem echten Protestanten in Fleisch und Blut übergegangen sein." D. F. Estes.

The Johannine Literature and the Acts of the Apostles.

By Henry Prentiss Forbes, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature in the Canton Theological School. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London, 1907. Price, $2.00.

This is the fourth and concluding volume of the "International Handbooks to the New Testament", a series of commentaries representing and adapted to "liberal" thinkers, so-called. This work of Professor Forbes does not suffer in comparison with the previous volumes by President Cary, Professor Cone, and Principal Drummond. It well carries out the original purpose, which is thus stated by the general editor, Dr. Cone: "to furnish a series of Handbooks to the New Testament which should meet the wants of the general reader, and at the same time present the results of the latest scholarship and of the most thorough critical investigation." "The space generally devoted in commentaries to a minute examination of the grammatical construction of passages of minor importance is occupied with the discussion of those of a special interest from a doctrinal and practical point of view." "More prominence has been given to the statement of the results of the critical processes than to the presentation of the details of these processes by means of extended discussions of questions of Greek grammar, philology, and exegesis." Accordingly while a good general impression of the course of thought may almost always be secured, this volume, like its predecessors in this series, gives as little aid as it intends to such students as believe that only by careful study of the exact language can its real meaning be secured. Also, while "the aim of the writers has been to ascertain and clearly set forth the meaning of the

authors of these books by the application of this the historical method in freedom from dogmatic prepossessions", it is not for a moment to be supposed that they have succeeded in ridding themselves of such prepossessions. On the contrary, they stand out on every page, as they must, and indeed, ought. What the author thinks of the untrustworthiness of Scripture and of its lack of inspiration in any proper sense of miracle, of the real nature of Jesus and of the work which he actually accomplished in and for this world, and what he thinks on many other points limits and moulds his comments. For example, the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand is simply set aside; the turning of the water into wine and the raising of Lazarus are regarded as allegory or spiritual representation; the teaching in I John 2:2 is clearly stated and then set aside by the characterization "Pauline and Alexandrian". Whoever reads this commentary should read it as from a particular school of thinkers for that school. Yet it should be recognized that its spirit and temper are in purpose at least reverent, in harmony with Professor Forbes' own words: "Even those who cannot accept the Logos-Christ of its [the Fourth Gospel] pages can follow the Jesus whose 'meat and drink it was to do his Father's will'." D. F. Estes.

The Trial of Jesus from Jesus Sources.

By Rabbi A. P. Drucker. Bloch Publishing Co., New York, 1907. Price, 25 cents. Pages 64.

This is a very interesting and also a very sad book. It is interesting in showing the mind of a present-day Jewish rabbi who admires Jesus and considers him the leader of the Jews of his day. It is sad since one sees how difficult it is for the modern Jew to understand Jesus. I have read a good many books in my day, but I do not recall that I ever noticed so many errors in one book and it is only 64 pages long. The point of the whole book is that the trial of Jesus as told in the Gospels violated Jewish legal procedure at almost every point and therefore Christ was never before the Sanhedrin at all. He was merely the victim of Pilate's hate and Caiaphas's

treachery. If we could only find out facts by logic! The violation of legal procedure shows the intensity of Jewish hate, not the non-existence of the trial. Rabbi Drucker rankles under the stigma that Jesus with all his innocence was condemned by the Sanhedrin. But wishes do not change history.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Crucifixion Viewed from a Jewish Standpoint.

By Dr. E. G. Hirsch. The Bloch Publishing Co., New York. Pages 49.

This is not a new book, but I have been interested to look it over. It is sad to see how tight an able Jewish scholar will close his eyes by prejudice. He declines to recognize what the Talmud, what Josephus, what the Gospels say about Jesus. He considers what Paul has to say to be very little and most of that manufactured. Therefore we know nothing much. Therefore the Jews are not responsible for the death of Jesus, the point to be proved. But the book shows how keenly the Jews rankle under the guilt of the death of Christ, the noblest man of the ages. It does not show that they have any desire to take him as Messiah, but merely to brush him aside.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

By Kirsopp Lake, M.A., Professor of N. T. Exegesis and Early Christian Literature in the University of Leiden. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. Williams & Norgate, London, 1907. Crown Theological Library. Pages 291.

This is an able, but on the whole a sad book. The author seems to realize that he is drifting away from the evangelical standpoint. He admits that his conclusions "are nevertheless an entire abandonment of the central doctrine of Christianity—the unique and miraculous character of the Resurrection." It is rather odd that Dr. Lake should occupy the chair of the famous Doctor Van Manen who discovered that Paul wrote none of the letters that bear his name and perhaps never even existed. Dr. Lake seems to have felt the force of his surroundings. He seems abnormally sceptical and credulous besides in accepting

very thin explanations for the side of radical criticism. He credits the wildest vagaries of criticism as secure results of scholarship and looks askance at a statement in the Gospels. This is a serious charge to make, but this is much the temper of Dr. Lake's mind. He insists too narrowly on the Marcan narrative as the test of the rest and rules John out of court. Dr. Lake is willing to admit that Jesus still lives, but denies that his body ever came out of the tomb. He conceives that Christ's resurrection had to be just what ours will be in all respects and magnifies every variation in the Resurrection narratives. He admits that his philosophy makes a bodily resurrection impossible. This is the key to Dr. Lake's point of view. He had settled it before he weighed the evidence.

A. T. Robertson.

The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ. Viewed in some of its aspects.

By R. J. Knowling, D.D. Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1905. Pages 533.

This volume I have meant to call attention to for a long time, but could never get to it somehow. It is too late now for a formal review and I shall not attempt it. Suffice it to say that there is no more thorough treatment of this important theme. Paul's relation to Christ is a subject that will grow in interest and this book of Dr. Knowling will be valuable to every student of Christ and Paul.

A. T. Robertson.

The Christ Face in Art.

By James Burns. With sixty-two illustrations. E. P. Dutton & Co., New York, 1907. Price, $2.00 net. Pages 252.

The lover of art and the disciple of Jesus will not be disappointed in this volume. The author may attach too much importance to these imaginative representations of Jesus. He is not sure that we do not have a real conception of the face of Jesus. But the points of great value in the book are the pictures by the great masters shown in order of development and the luminous comments of the author. The total effect is

most pleasing. The pictures vary greatly in merit, to be sure, but the great variety illustrate well the point of view of different ages and different nations. There is indeed a sense of failure in it all, but not wholly. Each artist has aimed at the best in man and has not always failed in all points. Some, in fact, are marvels of beauty and poetic truth though all must miss much the glory of the Son of Man.

A. T. Robertson.

The Cities of St. Paul. Their influence on His life and thought.

By Sir W. M. Ramsay, Kt., Hon. D. C. L., Professor of Humanity in the University of Aberdeen. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York; Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1908. Pages 452.

Sir William Ramsay continues to throw light on the life of Paul. He apologizes indeed at the end of the volume and says that some men spend their time reading the many books about Paul and then adding more without much study of Paul himself. There is too much truth in that criticism. But certainly no one can lay it to the charge of Dr. Ramsay who, more than any man of our time, has made his Pauline studies first hand. He has been on the field and made prolonged and renewed researches concerning the field of Paul's work. He has come to the life of Paul from a fresh angle and with an open mind. I am glad to say that no living man has taught me so much about Paul as Sir William Ramsay.

This volume is not mere geography, though geography is not to be despised. Far from it. Few subjects are so illuminating, and Dr. Ramsay is the master of modern men in his knowledge of the geography of Asia Minor. This volume has some 63 pictures, cuts and maps that throw light on various aspects of the subject. I say it is not mere geography, but historical geography and philosophical history. Part I is a bold and strong presentation of Paulinism in the Roman World, while Part II discusses St. Paul in the Roman World. Dr. Ramsay knows that he will not be believed by all when he claims that Paul was a great philosopher whose philosophy gave a new turn to the current of Greek philosophy, but he makes a strong case. I am glad to note how strongly Dr. Ramsay insists on

the Hellenic side of Paul's life. We must add that to the Hebraic and the Christian sides if we are to understand the fulness of Paul's strength. Paul in the opinion of Dr. Ramsay has not yet been appraised for his full worth.

Indeed Dr. Ramsay predicts that the whole of imperial Roman history must be rewritten in the light of the struggle between the church and the empire, not as an incident, but as the main thing in the life of the empire. That conflict settled the destiny of both church and empire. The compromise under Constantine wiped out the empire and obscured Paulinism till the Reformation under Luther. But it is hardly possible to give one a full idea of the strength of this book. The present volume deals only with the cities of Asia Minor, Tarsus, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Derbe, Lystra. The author passes by Antioch in Syria and Jerusalem and the cities of the Aegean. He promises another volume on the Aegean cities. Why not one on Antioch in Syria and Jerusalem in their relation to Paul?

A. T. Robertson.

III. CHURCH HISTORY.

History of the Christian Church. By Philip Schaff.

Vol. V, Part I—The Middle Ages from Gregory VII, 1049, to Boniface VIII, 1294.

By David S. Schaff, D.D., Prefessor in the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1907. Price $3.25. Pages 910.

It is generally conceded that Dr. Philip Schaff was our greatest church historian. Naturally it has been a matter of keen regret that he did not live to finish the great work on church history which he had projected and was so nobly prosecuting when death overtook him. In his son, the Rev. David S. Schaff, he has a worthy successor who has undertaken to complete his father's work, at least in so far as the Mediaeval Age is concerned. This will make the entire work complete through the German and Swiss Reformations. Contrary to the plans of his father the author is devoting two stout volumes

to the Middle Ages from 1049 to 1517. This is at once a recognition of the enormous amount of work that has been done in recent years on this period and a testimony to the increasing conception of the importance of the period. This amount of space is in fact necessary to the attainment of an adequate treatment, such as the father had given of other periods in the earlier volumes.

The present volume covers the period from 1049 to 1294, the most brilliant and glorious period of papal history. It is the great period of Catholic revival, presenting many features of great interest for succeeding centuries. This period Dr. Schaff has treated with a fulness not before attempted in any general history in English. The fulness is not due to the multiplication of unimportant details, the temptation of every historian, but to the broad, adequate treatment of the important phases of the history. There is enough incident and detail to enliven the narrative, but the broad outlines and great currents of the history are of chief interest The treatment is not strictly chronological. The salient and important features of the entire period are taken up one by one and given a treatment that leaves little to be desired. Some conception of the character and scope can be gathered from the following distribution of space: The volume opens with a discussion of the popes of the period, what might be called the outward political history of the church, covering 210 pages; then follows 97 pages on the Crusades, 119 pages on Monasticism in this its flourishing period, 17 pages on missions, 13 pages on the treatment and sufferings of the Jews, 76 pages on the dissenters of the period, Albigenses, Waldenses, etc., with the establishment of the Inquisition and the efforts at their suppression; 53 pages on schools and cathedrals, 177 pages on the various phases of Catholic theology, including mysticism, scholasticism, the sacramental system, indulgences, sin and grace, the future state, etc.; 66 pages on the hierarchy, including such sub-topics as canon law, the Pope and the Curia, the Councils, the clergy in England; the remainder of the volume is devoted to worship, including such subjects as the worship of Mary, preaching, sacred poetry, demonology and popular

superstitions. The whole is provided with a fairly complete index and table of contents.

This distribution of topics and space indicates the comprehensiveness and adequateness of the plan. The quality of the work is in all respects equal to the plan. The author has acquired a mastery of his theme from a thorough study of the sources as well as diligent use of the latest investigations of other competent scholars. He never allows himself to be swamped by details on the one hand, nor does he permit himself to present only the dry bones of outline on the other. He holds himself to the important, the significant, the elevated. The treatment is vital, genetic, causal; the narrative permits the reader to see living men and women bending at their tasks, laboring at their problems, battling with the adverse forces of the world of sin. He shows many of the best qualities of his great father. He is equally master of his subject, his style is equally interesting, his material is in better proportion; he is perhaps not so profoundly religious in his treatment as was his father, at least there are not so many digressions intended for edification; nor does he stop to draw the great parallels which are an interesting characteristic of his father's style. On the whole we may say that the volume is entirely worthy of its place in the midst of the great work projected but not completed by his father. It is in harmony with the very best historical work of America and Europe, and is welcomed by the reviewer with unalloyed pleasure. It is to be hoped that Dr. Schaff will not only complete the other volume on the Middle Ages, but also continue the whole on the same comprehensive plan down to the present time, or at least finish the Reformation era. W. J. McGlothlin.

Virginia Presbyterianism and Religious Liberty, Colonial and Revolutionary Times.

By Thos. Cary Johnson, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va. Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va., 1907. Pages 128.

The struggle for religious liberty in the United States is of perennial interest. Virginia furnished the most spectacular features of that great effort, in which the Presbyterians took an honorable part. They were especially efficient in the

Revolutionary struggle for political freedom. Many of the officers and chaplains in the colonial army were Presbyterians and they also furnished their full quota of privates. They were not so consistent in their attitude towards religious freedom. They were deeply influenced by European traditions. A few years after Roger Williams had established the new state of Rhode Island on the basis of religious freedom, the first state in history to be so founded, the Parliament of England was laboring to make Presbyterianism the established religion of the realm; it was and still is the state church of Scotland. It is not strange that the Scotch and Scotch-Irish of America should be slow in coming to adopt the American ideal. They never made Presbyterianism the established religion of any of the colonies. They never anywhere possessed sufficient strength to do this had they so wished. By the showing of Dr. Johnson they demanded only toleration for themselves until about 1776, when they began to demand religious equality and even freedom. But even as late as 1784 they express a reluctant assent to a general assessment in the interest of all denominations. On the contrary the Baptists had for several years been suffering imprisonment for their disobedience to state laws establishing religion. The Presbyterians fought for the freedom enjoyed in England under the Act of Toleration, 1689; the Baptists for the freedom wherewith Christ had made them free.

The author is not writing a history of the struggle for religious liberty in Virginia, but only of the part taken by the Presbyterians. He recognizes that constituted only one factor in the great struggle. He reproduces many of the most important Presbyterian documents bearing on the subject; also extracts from diaries and other papers of Madison, Henry and others. These constitute a valuable feature of the work. In concluding he undoubtedly claims too much for the Presbyterians. He says (p. 120): "It is clear that the great mass of Presbyterians were *always true* to the cause; that they generally furnished the effective leadership in the fight for it; that they excelled in the pleas which were put forth in behalf of "soul liberty, etc." This statement is disproved by the Pres-

byterian documents given by the author himself as well as by quotations from Madison. Patrick Henry, who is claimed as an exponent of Presbyterian ideals, was an earnest advocate of a general assessment in the interest of all denominations. It would have been a miracle for the Presbyterians of Virginia to be so far in advance of their confreres in the rest of the world. No miracle was wrought. W. J. McGlothlin.

Die russischen Sekten.

Von. Mag. theol. Karl Konrad Grass, Privatdozent in Dorpat. Erster Band. Die Gottesleute oder Chlüsten nebst Skakunen, Maljowanzü, Panijaschkowzü u. a. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1907. Price 15 M. Pages 716.

The comprehensiveness of the title is disappointing. Not all the Russian sects, not even the most important ones, are treated; neither the Schismatics who differ from the orthodox church chiefly in cultus nor the sects which seem to be the result of western evangelical work, e. g., the Stundists, Baptists, etc., find any place in the book, but those only which have arisen out of the Greek church. Thus the sanest and most promising of the independent parties are not treated. Moreover the author, being a systematic theologian rather than church historian, has avowedly approached the subject from that standpoint. He is chiefly interested in their theology and devotes himself principally to that subject. And here he has done a notable piece of work. From numerous widely scattered Russian sources he has gathered vast stores of information; he has traveled in Russia, examined libraries public and private, and as far as possible come in contact with the sects, but has used unpublished acts of court processes but little. He claims to have brought together the results of recent investigations more completely than any of his Russian or German predecessors. Certainly it is a wonderful story of strange superstitions, Christian fortitude, bitter persecution. The author declares the Chlüsten or "God's people", the sect to which he gives most attention, number from one hundred and fifty to two hundred thousand and to be scattered over the whole of Russia. They are enrolled in the state church but have their own secret meetings; union with the sect uni-

formly means improvement in the life. They are not so numerous or important as the Stundists who are found, however, in southern Russia only. W. J. McGLOTHLIN.

Das Veto der Katholischen Staaten bei der Papstwahl seit dem Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts. Mit Benützung. Von unpublizierten Akten aus römischen Archiven und dem k. u. k. Haus-Hof-und Staatsarchiv in Wien.

Von Dr. Alexander Eisler. Wien, 1907. Pages 362.

The enormous political influence of the pope has made his personality and attitude of the utmost importance to the Catholic powers. This has led them from the earliest times to make all possible efforts to effect the election of a man favorable to their purposes and aspirations. While the pope was a vassal of the emperor the task was a comparatively easy one. But as the pope built up an ecclesiastical state which enabled him to become an independent prince the task of the empire became more difficult and the way was opened for the exercise of influence by other powers upon the papal elections. This influence has been exerted in many ways and continuously despite all efforts of the church to shake itself free from all external political machinations. The church has never willingly recognized any external pressure as legal, and yet has tacitly permitted it throughout the centuries.

The latest form of infleunce is the right of veto exercised by various Catholic powers. The national influence is exercised not so much in favor of some candidate as against one or more aspirants whose election, it is thought, would be inimical to national interests. It is the growth of this practice or "right" which Dr. Eisler considers. Others have written on the subject but he claims to have had access to material not before used. The treatment is critical, sound, interesting. The author claims that the practice can not be called a *right,* that the church has never recognized it as such, but that it has been tolerated until it has grown into a recognized custom which has almost the validity of a right. He combats all other views of the strange practice, and makes out a strong case for his position.

There is copious reference to sources, and many important extracts in an appendix. The work is an interesting and scholarly discussion of an important Catholic practice.

W. J. McGlothlin.

The Inquisition in the Spanish Dependencies—Sicily, Naples, Sardinia, Milan, The Canaries, Mexico, Peru, New Grenada.

By Henry Charles Lea, LL.D., S. T. D. The MacMillan Co., New York., 1908. Price $2.50 net. Pages 564.

This volume is the natural sequel to Dr. Lea's work on *The Inquisition in Spain*, which has been reviewed in these columns. Much of the material must have been collected in preparation for the larger undertaking. It is, however, not yet quite complete as the Inquisition in the Netherlands is not treated owing to the fact that the archives have not yet been sufficiently examined. It manifests Dr. Lea's well-known mastery of details, thorough investigation of the sources and clear and fair statement.

It is rather start'ing to find the same inquisitorial methods, the same horrid spectacular punishments in our sister republics on the south, Mexico and Peru, as obtained in Spain itself. As in the mother country itself heresy, bigamy, adultery and other sins were visited by the death penalty relentlessly. The book reminds us afresh of the blessing that lies in the fact that most of North America is Protestant rather than Catholic. What would have been the history of the world, had Spain colonized North as well as Central and South America? Many Protestant English suffered the death penalty in Mexico and Peru. Traders were often seized by the Inquisition while engaged in legitimate business and brought to an untimely end.

As in the preceding volumes there is an appendix with many important illustrative documents in the original Latin and Spanish. The whole is provided with an excellent index. In this volume we have for the first time any adequate treatment of the history of the Inquisition in those countries once dependent on Spain.

W. J. McGlothlin.

The Ifs of History.

By Joseph Edgar Chamberlin. Henry Altemus Co., Philadelphia. Pages 203.

The purpose of the author seems to be to show that all that is best in our Western livilization—religion, freedom, character—is the result of a series of historical accidents upon which the most tremendous issues turned. If the Persians had defeated the Greeks at Salamis, Mithra would now be the god of the Europeans; if the Mohammedans had defeated Charles Martel at Tours, Europe would now be Mohammedan; and so with other features of our Western civilization. Nothing can be more idle and futile than such speculations. The author thinks his suggestions will affect the stern necessity of the evolutionary conception of history. But it is as absurdly extreme as that view and will do nothing to affect it. Such a view of history utterly ignores the great forces that move in society and are not turned back or aside by trifling incidents. Defeat at Tours would not have been the annihilation of the Christians or the exhaustion of their resources or powers of resistance. Beyond question there are contingencies in history, but there are also mighty forces that are not accidentally overcome, great streams that are not deflected or dammed by a pebble. The suggestions are stimulating, but they cannot be accepted for a moment. W. J. McGlothlin.

The English Reformation and Puritanism with other Lectures and Addresses.

By Eri B. Hulbert, D.D., LL.D. A memorial edited by A. R. E. Wyant, Ph. D University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1908. Price $2.50 net. Pages 484.

Dr. Hulbert wrote no books. His colleagues say he could not be brought to write, believing that his work was in the class-room and the building up of institutions rather than in writing books. It is in a way refreshing to find a real scholar who has courage to resist the tacit demand that a scholar shall write books, courage to give himself unreservedly to the work of teaching. His renunciation, if renunciation it was, had its rewards. By all accounts he was a teacher of marvelous attractiveness and power, holding the undivided attention and

stirring the noblest and deepest emotions of his students. He did not devote himself to minute investigations in original sources, but gathering his material from expert investigators who had gone before him, he conceived the historical situation vitally and vividly and presented it so clearly and accurately, so rhetorically, almost oratorically, that students could be arrested and impressed. These papers prepared for the most part from his notes, reveal all these qualities. There is a splendid indignation at all wrong, error, hypocrisy, splendid faith in and enthusiasm for the noble, self-sacrificing, faithful. Along with the lectures on the English Reformation are papers of appreciation by various persons, and some additional papers by Dr. Hulbert on such subjects as the Education Act of 1902, Baptists of Today in Great Britain and Ireland, The Baptist Outlook, etc. The whole is printed and bound in such a substantial and tasteful manner as to make a very worthy memorial volume. If one wants to know how interesting and stimulating Church History can be made let him read this volume.

W. J. McGlothlin.

The Life of Edward Henry Bickersteth, D.D., Bishop and Poet.

By Francis Keyes Aglionby, M. A., Vicar of Christ Church, Westminster. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York, 1907. Pages 222.

Mr. Aglionby was one of the examining chaplains of Bishop Bickersteth and had ample opportunity to know the real life of the author of "Peace, Perfect Peace", "Yesterday, Today, and Forever". The volume is marked by intelligent and skillful use of the materials, and original sources are quoted wherever possible. The result is a sympathetic and worthy memorial of the Christian poet, for it is by that his name will last. He was a noble Bishop at Exeter, but there have been bishops in plenty. It is not an eventful life that is here recorded, but one worth recording none the less for its normal development in culture and grace and the highest service. The poet lived his poetry and that is much to know. The pictures of the man and places of work give added interest to the volume.

A. T. Robertson.

The Life of George Matheson, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E.

By D. Macmillan, M.A., D.D., minister of Kelvinhaugh Parish, Glasgow. A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 1907. Pages 369.

Few lives of the nineteenth century are more worth telling than that of George Matheson, preacher, poet, author, mystic, scholar. Son of a successful Glasgow merchant, a brilliant student in the great university of his native city, afflicted with almost total blindness from early youth, he devoted himself to the ministry of the State Church of Scotland with a singleness of purpose and an effectiveness that was hardly equaled in any of the pulpits of Scotland. His great learning, his mystical piety, his poetic tastes, his sympathy with modern thought, made him peculiarly helpful to the large and cultured audiences that waited on his ministry for thirty-five years. He had passed through the dark regions of doubt and emerged triumphant on the sunny hills beyond; he knew the road and the feelings of travelers along the gloomy way, and was thus providentially prepared to help them. His triumph over his serious physical disability was an inspiration to other men. He was no mean hymn writer. Who can ever forget the haunting melody of rythm and music in "O love, that will not let me go?"

The author has done a very good piece of biographical work, fortifying his conclusions with numerous extracts from Matheson and others. It is to be hoped that readers of Matheson's "Representative Men of the Bible" will also get acquainted with his beautiful and inspiring life through this excellent biography.

W. J. McGlothlin

IV.— SUNDAY SCHOOL AND EVANGELISM.

THE NATIONAL TEACHER-TRAINING INSTITUTE TEXT-BOOKS.

BOOK II.

The Sunday School Teachers' Pupils.

Edited by Rev. H. T. Musselman, Superintendent American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia.

It would not be easy to find another book equal to this volume in merit when we consider purpose, contents, style and

size. Many a teacher and pupil will read it with delight and profit. It consists of two parts with ten chapters in each part.

Part One is devoted to Pupils in General. Beginning with the Study of Human Nature the various stages of development from infancy to maturity are discussed in an intelligent, up-to-date and pedagogical manner with special reference to Sunday school efficiency.

In Part Two "The Mind of the Pupil" is studied in the light of its various faculties or functions, as sensation and perception, attention and interest, apperception, memory, thought, emotion, will, and religion and morals. At the close of each chapter there are suggested topics for class discussion and class papers.

It is what many teachers and pastors have long desired and well deserves an extensive circulation.

B. H. DeMent.

Our Sixty-Six Sacred Books, or how our Bible was made.

By the Rev. Edwin W. Rice, D.D. American Sunday School Union, Philadelphia.

This is a revised and enlarged edition with analysis and questions suggestive to all students of the Bible. The book merits the extended circulation it has received and in this revision some recent critical treatises on the Old Testament are briefly considered, and due recognition is given to the increased popularity of the Revised Versions of the Bible and to its growing circulation. The author says the purpose of the revision is "to incorporate the accepted results of recent explorations and the researches of critical scholars within the past decade." The treatment of versions, manuscripts, date, authorship, and structure of the Bible is sane, scholarly and conservative. The brief analysis of each book, and divers items, the contents, history and circulation of the Bible are helpful to the thoughtful student. It is a compact volume of 218 pages, written in clear, pointed English by a master of logical analysis and Biblical details.

B. H. DeMent.

The Boys' Life of Christ.

William Byron Forbush. Teacher's Edition. Funk & Wagnalls, New York. Price, $1.25.

The author of "The Boy Problem" and "The Travel Lessons on the Life of Jesus" is eminently qualified to write "The Boys' Life of Christ", and many a youth, parent and teacher will be grateful to him for this signal service.

The style and contents are adapted to the heroic age of boyhood. Special emphasis is laid on what Jesus did. The royal and heroic are made to stand forth with such clearness and prominence that the volume might be called "The Kingship of Jesus".

In twenty-five chapters and 263 pages we have many of the incidents in the life of Christ presented in graphic way to appeal to the manly, the chivalric and the active qualities of boyhood and youth. The imagination is employed enough to make the scenes live before the mind, but not enough to divert attention to the painter's brush.

There are 41 pages of valuable notes on the various places referred to in the narrative and these are invested with a vital and historic reality.

The 38 pages of suggestions for teachers will be serviceable to those who use the volume as a text-book on the life of Christ.

B. H. DeMent.

The Boy Jesus.

By Rev. Cortland Meyers, D.D. The American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia.

Dr. Meyers is widely known as one of the greatest soul-winners of this generation, while his writings are characterized by a charming simplicity and directness. In a dozen chapters and eighty pages he tells much of what a bright, enquiring boy would be pleased to know about Jesus who is graphically depicted in home, school, church, shop, field, trade, etc., as the ideal boy. The twelve illustrations from famous paintings and the exquisite mechanical execution are in harmony with the winsome contents.

B. H. DeMent.

Sunday School Records, Reports and Recognitions.

By E. A. Fox, General Secretary Kentucky Sunday School Association. The Sunday School Times Co., Philadelphia. Price, 50 cents. Pages 111.

The Sunday schools of today are devoting more attention than formerly to securing a complete and accurate record of every phase of their work. To those officers and teachers who wish to examine a variety of the best methods of dealing with the problems of attendance and record we recommend a careful reading of the twelve chapters in this timely little volume.

B. H. DeMent.

Up Through Childhood.

By George Allen Hubbell, Ph. D., Vice-President of Berea College. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

The contributions that Psychology is making to the art of mental discipline and character-building are becoming fully realized and disseminated. Dr. Hubbell has produced a readable volume in which he discusses "some principles of education in relation to Faith and Conduct". There is nothing especially striking in the views of the author nor in their expression, but the scope of topics is comprehensive and treatment smooth and helpful to those interested in the most vital elements of religious culture.

Part I deals with "The School of Life". Life is opportunity, the aim of education, and the institutions of education—the home, the school, the church and the Sunday school.

Part II treats of "The Teacher"—his work, his preparation, his text-book and his pupil.

In Part III "The Learner" is studied from the view-point of psychology—e. g., man's nature, environment, the senses, attention, apperception, interest, memory, imagination, motive, habit, will, etc.

Part IV consists of only one chapter—"The Graduate", or "The Rounded Life".

The book is worthy of a place in the teacher's library.

B. H. DeMent.

Simples from the Master's Garden.

Annie Trumbull Slossom. The Sunday School Times Company. Price, $1.00 net.

In the opening chapter of this charming little book the author enlists our interest and sympathy by the touching picture of "The Master's Garden", and this interest is maintained undiminished through the five succeeding chapters. Each chapter gives us a delightful glimpse into the life of one of the humbler little flowers found in this garden of rare beauty and simplicity.

The material, style and characters are all original and striking, interesting alike to the children and the older ones.

B. H. DeMent.

Evangelism in the Pew.

By J. C. Massee. The Winona Publishing Co., Chicago, 1907. Pages 177.

A vision of two chief needs in the churches has moved the author to send forth this book: First, more pastors consumed with evangelistic zeal, and, second, more churches inflamed with a kindred spirit, and likewise committed to the great work of the Kingdom, whose chief business is the making of disciples to Jesus Christ. To awaken and inspire men and women toward this service is its only mission. The author hopes it may be used as a class book of study in young people's societies, personal workers' classes, and in the study of many pastors.

Gradually, he says, the holy enthusiasm that was the supreme passion of Jesus and his immediate followers burned itself out as an untended fire. "There is fire still in the embers, but the embers have fallen apart." "It has been eighteen centuries since the church was dominated by the supreme passion of Jesus." "There is a smoldering warmth in the creed; but there is no holy flame leaping and lighting and heating the life of the church." "The church has fallen upon a season of Laodicean Coldness." "There needs to be created again the consciousness of the earnestness of Lord Jesus in his search for souls. "There needs also to be restored the consciousness of the partnership of his people in this consuming zeal of the

Master." "For the most part the church resents the great commission." "A small, though a growing number, are taking up this most fascinating work God ever had to give to men." These quotations will give the reader the author's point of view and purpose, and reveal to him also the spirit in which the high task is pursued. The book is another earnest contribution to a subject that is everywhere today commanding attention and awakening thought. GEO. B. EAGER.

V. MISSIONS.

The Highway of Mission Thought. Eight of the Greatest Discourses on Missions.

Edited by T. B. Ray, Educational Secretary Foreign Mission Board, Richmond, Va. Sunday School Board Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. Price 75 cents postpaid.

The Sunday School Board and Dr. Ray have rendered a valuable service to the cause of missions in issuing this striking volume of sermonic masterpieces. The editor illuminated each discourse by giving a brief graphic biographical sketch of the preacher, and by indicating the occasion on which the sermon was delivered.

We can do no better than present the topic of each discourse and the speaker, as found in the table of contents:

1. An Enquiring into the Obligations of Christians to Use Means for the Conversion of the Heathens.—Wm. Carey.
2. The Star in the East.—Claudius Buchanan.
3. The Attraction of the Cross.—John Angell James.
4. Moral Dignity of the Mission Enterprise—Francis Wayland.
5. Vindication of Missions in India.—Alexander Duff.
6. The Missionary Trials of the Church.—William Conner Magee.
7. Apostolic Mission, or the Gospel for Every Creature.—Joseph Angus.
8. Heroism of Foreign Missions.—Philips Brooks.

The merited circulation of this volume would give a powerful impulse to the missionary enterprise. B. H. DEMENT.

The Dharma: The religion of enlightenment—An exposition of Buddhism.

By Paul Carus. Fifth Edition, revised and enlarged. Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago. Kegan, Paul, Trench, Treubner & Co., London, 1907. Pages 169.

That every man is a lamp unto himself is a favorite principle of Buddhism. This principle evidently appeals with power to the author of this book, which is an attempt to set forth the essential teachings of Buddhism. The merits of Buddhism are numerous, according to the view here held. It has no dogmas and no revelation. It has no personal authority of any kind. There is no conflict between science and religion in Buddhism, because Buddhism does not deal with ultimate things, or at least does not dogmatize about them. The author thinks that modern psychology confirms the Buddhist view of the soul, that it is phenomenal rather than a distinct and permanent entity in itself. Buddhism denies the notion that there is an independent personal self and that the welfare of the self is the main purpose of existence. Nirvana is the cessation of individual existence. The self is identified with the truths of which it consists—whatever this identification may mean. Nirvana is the surrender of self to the truth. Buddhism is the religion of deliverance from evil through enlightenment.

It is not difficult to recognize the points of contact between Christianity and Buddhism in this exposition, or in any other which gives any adequate view of Buddhism, but one is constrained to feel that the author, in interpreting the moral side of Buddhism, reads a good deal of Christianity into it, and interprets Buddhism from the point of view of the environment and consciousness created in a Christian civilization and through a Christian literature. The book, as a brief exposition of the principles of Buddhism, is to be heartily commended.

E. Y. Mullins.

The Inward Light.

By H. Fielding Hall, author of "The Soul of the People," etc. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1908. Price $1.75 net. Pages 228.

The inward light is Buddhism and specifically the Buddhism of Burma. The purpose of the book as stated by the author (p.

10), "is to explain and illustrate really what Buddhism is." He seems to be an Englishman who has been seduced by the Mysticism of the East into becoming a convinced Buddhist. He glorifies his new found faith and its effects upon men. It, he claims, is alone rational, eschewing revelation, offering the only reasonable immortality, pointing away from weakness, sin and suffering to purity, joy and gladness; it leads men to think not of sin but of righteousness; it produces the most beautiful family life, puts the soul into connection with the eternal source of all things.

This is not the place to discuss Buddhism. The author's presentation is attractive. In form it is the experiences and reflections of a wounded Englishman in Burma in contact with the Buddhist monks and the village life of the Burmese. There are bits of beautiful description, references to interesting native customs, etc. One feels the almost weird spell which Eastern faiths cast over some Western minds. The weakness of these faiths is equally apparent. The insignificance of the individual, the futility of all his endeavors and aspirations, the depressing effects of contemplation are all painfully present. With such a faith greatness is impossible. The individual is restrained and depressed rather than stimulated to endeavor.

W. J. McGlothlin.

Islam, a Challenge to Faith. Studies on the Mohammedan religion and the needs and opportunities of the Mohammedan world from the standpoint of Christian Missions.

By Sam'l M. Zwemer, F. R. G. S., Secretary Student Volunteer Movement, Missionary in Arabia. The Student Volunteer Movement, New York, 1907.

The author of this volume is already widely and favorably known to the Christian world through his work as a missionary and his work as secretary of the Student Volunteer Movement, as well as by other publications on Mohammedanism. He approaches the subject from the missionary rather than the scientific standpoint. He is seeking to show that Mohammedan fields offer an opportunity today as never before—are a "challenge to faith". At the same time the author has supplemented his personal knowledge of the fields and the religion by the

use of the scientific studies of others. The "book lays no claim to originality save in the form in which the results of the labors of others in this wide field are presented".

The author is optimistic, hopeful for the future of Mohammedan missions. He believes today offers a crisis, an opportunity, which Christianity does not miss or neglect. In the brief compass of this work there is a fairly comprehensive and satisfactory treatment of the origin, content, history and present condition of Mohammedanism. Few volumes of equal size contains so much valuable information and inspiration for the pastor. W. J. McGLOTHLIN.

The Fruit of the Desert.

By Everett T. Tomlinson. The Griffith & Rowland Press, Philadelphia and London. 1907. Pages 492. Price, $2.00.

Frontier missions have furnished material for several admirable stories such as Black Rock, Sky Pilot, etc. Hitherto, these have dealt chiefly with missions in the Northwest. "The Fruit of the Desert" is an excellent story of mission work in the Indian Territory. The missionary, Hugh Bradford, is a manly young fellow, with the right spirit in him. The difficulties and discouragements with the brighter sides of missionary labor are well told, and there is a delightful story of pure and high human love. The book can be heartily recommended.

W. J. McGLOTHLIN.

VI. APOLOGETIC AND POLEMIC THEOLOGY.

The Philosophical Basis of Religion.

By John Watson, M. A., LL.D. James Maclehose & Sons, 1907.

Modern philosophy is being invaded by idealism. The older materialistic conception of the world is giving place to this type of philosophy which is a vast improvement upon it. We have here 466 pages of closely reasoned exposition of the general thought contained in the title. In the first lecture the author discusses religion and authority. He says religion is at once a life, a creed, and a ritual, and as any one of these constituents may be accentuated, there are three main types of re-

ligious philosophy which follow. The second type is the one which the author considers first—religion as a creed. Christian dogma was inevitable, and Christian philosophy was a means of defining Christian ideas. Authority arose inevitably as a means of safeguarding dogma. The author discusses quite sympathetically Newman's theory of development, though he rejects it of course in part. He says Newman's theory is wrong in not recognizing that reflection enrishes faith, and is also wrong in viewing doctrine as a symbol of faith. He replies to Dr. Wildred Ward's new defence of authority, claiming that the authority of experts rests ultimately upon the rationality of the universe and the identity of reason in all men, and not merely upon expert authority. In like manner, the authority of the church is ultimately the authority of reason. Out of this arises the conclusion that reason is the only basis of morality and religion.

In the fourth lecture the author sets forth idealism as a philosophy of religion. He distinguishes between speculative or constructive idealism and other types of idealism. Personal idealism, he thinks, cannot constitute an ultimate explanation of things, because it shuts up the individual in a closed circle of personality and excludes God really from the experiences of men. The idealism dominating our thinking is that which allows for the free interplay of personal beings throughout the universe.

The author gives a very interesting discussion of types of religious opinion throughout the world's history, including an exposition of Philo in his relation to the New Testament, an exposition of the Gnostic theology. Augustine's phases of faith, and his theology, and mediaeval theology, concluding his historical survey in a chapter on Leibnitz and Protestant Theology. In chapters 16 and 17 a summary is given of the idealistic view of the world. He distinguishes constructive idealism from pantheism. He shows, first, that there is a point of agreement between them in that both affirm that the world can have no reality apart from God, and therefore that the finite as such has no existence. But they differ in that pantheism conceives of the divine as equally manifested in

nature and in mind, putting the two on the same level. That is, it reduces the universe to the two great antithetical distinctions of matter and mind, each related to a single, permanent, and unchanging substance so that, according to Pantheism, the universe might with equal propriety be called God or nature. Constructive idealism, however, denies that matter and mind are manifestations of the divine in an equal degree. The rational principle of the universe is the highest revealed therein. So that this principle which constitutes the crown of the process of nature is not to be regarded as a manifestation of the divine on a plane so low as physical nature. The rational principle of course is implicit everywhere in nature, but it finds its highest expression in mind.

The book is a very interesting and suggestive discussion, and for all those who enjoy abstract reasoning it will prove interesting and helpful. One could wish that the author had not been so brief in his exposition of his views in the two closing chapters. Many questions are raised which remain unanswered, and some parts of the discussion are so compressed that it is difficult to grasp fully the principles advocated. We have sought above in the most condensed way to outline merely the general position of the book. The style is clear and the reasoning compact.

This book is a further illustration of how the idealistic philosophy, as stated at the outset, is invading human thinking. Like all thoroughgoing monistic schemes of philosophy, it seems impossible to reconcile all the facts of life with the general principle involved. At the same time, it is very suggestive as a purely philosophic attempt to explain the world.

E. Y. Mullins.

Die Entwickelung des Christentums.

Von D. Otto Pfleiderer, Professor an der Universität zu Berlin. München, J. F. Lehman's Verlag. 8 vo. Pp. IX+270.

The delivery and the publication of the course of lectures printed in the present volume were occasioned by the expressed desire of some non-theological readers of his lectures on "The

Rise of Christianity", published some years ago for a similar treatment of later Christian history, with a view to the demonstration of the correctness of his conception of the beginnings of Christianity. In another work, "Religion and Religions", he has taken a glance backward. Thus, in the three works, he has sought to show the universal applicability of his development view of religion.

For the history of the post-apostolic period he makes no pretense of possessing first-hand knowledge, but is content to use the materials contained in such well-known works as those of Baur and Hase, with whose interpretation of Christian history he is in substantial agreement.

In an "Introduction" of twenty-one pages he expounds somewhat fully his view of Christian history in contrast with a number of opposing views, which he freely criticizes. He adopts as his own Baur's definition of Christianity as "the religion of theandricity (*Gottmenschcit*), of the exaltation of men to the consciousness of their oneness with God and freedom in God." "This is the new and characteristic feature of Christianity whereby it stands above all other religions. This new religious principle was indeed already germinally present in Jesus, in his pious disposition, his living faith in God, and his pure love of humanity; but yet it was still enveloped in the Jewish forms of the Messianic idea and limited to the Jewish people, which naturally stands in contradiction with the idea of the theandric religion, which alone can embrace the whole of humanity.

He attributes to Paul the work of emancipating the elements of truth in the life and teachings of Jesus from Judaism and thinks Paul's interpretation of Christianity a great improvement upon the original. So he seeks to justify the further modifications that have come to Christianity from its contact with Greek philosophy and all later influences and to show that there has been a progressive development up to the present time and that the end is not yet.

Especially interesting is his criticism of the Ritschl-Harnack conception of Church History, which he regards as the old

Protestant pessimistic conception in a sharpened form. This school of thought regards the Christianity of the New Testament as complete and looks upon all post-apostolic changes as involving a serious lapse. The perfect essence of Christianity is, according to Ritschl, contained exclusively in the first three Gospels. It was his opinion that the man Jesus must be regarded by us as God because he alone was the true revealer of the will of God. Paul introduced corruption and disease into Christianity by mingling with it Pharisaic theology and a doctrine of sacraments: John corrupted it still further by the introduction of his divine Logos who became flesh in Jesus. The further mingling of the teachings of Jesus with Greek philosophy still further corrupted it. Pfleiderer feels that in seeking to stem the Ritschl-Harnack tide he is assuming a tremendous task, and yet his convictions on the subject are so fundamental that he feels bound to do what he can to correct error and to inculcate truth. By "development" he means "the regular and purposeful becoming, in which everything is fruit and everything is seed, every individual phenomenon being conditioned by the foregoing and conditioning those that follow". This definition applies, he thinks, to history, and he regards it as an absurdity to expect to find anything perfect at the beginning of a process of development.

The body of the work consists of two divisions with the Reformation as the dividing point, each sub-divided into eight sections or lectures. The topics of the lectures are: "Paul and John"; "Apologists and Antignostics"; "The Alexandrines, Clement and Origen"; "Dogma and Morals"; "Aurelius Augustinus"; "The Germanic-Roman Church"; "Scholasticism and Mysticism"; "Outgoing of the Middle Ages"; "Renaissance and German Reformation"; "Swiss Reformation and Dissenters"; "Catholic Counter-Reformation"; "Protestant Sects"; "The Illumination"; "German Poets and Thinkers"; "Romanticism, Speculation and Historical Criticism"; Reaction and New Conflicts".

It would be pleasant to quote bright sentences from each of these well-written and purposeful lectures. For seekers after truth, however radical may have been the results reached, he

has nothing but the warmest approval. For reactionaries of the most extreme types he knows how to account without imputing to them evil motives or thinking their influences wholly bad; for the worst forms of intolerance and dogmatism and bigotry provoked reactions that carried still further the principles of freedom and brotherhood. He rejoices greatly in the disposition of younger theologians in Germany and elsewhere to devote themselves magnanimously and enthusiastically to Christian-socialistic efforts for the well-being of the masses in the direction of education, charity, reconciliation of social classes, "in short for the Christianization of the whole life of the people and the secularization of Christianity in the Rothe's sense". He takes great satisfaction in the fact that the younger generation of theologians are not only thus widening their field of labor along these practical lines, but that "it is beginning of late to shake off the shoe-leather of the narrow dogmatism of their school-theology and unabashed to survey the broad province of general comparative science of religion". He looks forward hopefully to the achievements of Christianity in the twentieth century believing that much progress will be made in the direction of "the realization of the unity of God and man, the permeation of the entire ethical life of man with the powers of the divine Spirit of truth, freedom, love".

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN.

The Axioms of Religion.

By E. Y. Mullins, D.D., LL.D. American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1908. $1.00 net, postpaid. Pages 316.

What is the distinctive message of the Baptists to the world? President Mullins replies that it is "the principle of the competency of the soul under God in religion". He thus restates the Baptist position: "The biblical significance of the Baptists is the right of private interpretation and obedience to the Scriptures. The significance of the Baptists in relation to the individual is soul freedom. The ecclesiastical significance of the Baptists is a regenerated church membership and the equality and priesthood of believers. The political significance of the Baptists is the separation of Church and State. But as

comprehending all the above particulars, as a great and aggressive force in Christian history, as distinguished from all others and standing entirely alone, the doctrine of the soul's competency in religion under God is the distinctive historical significance of the Baptists." President Mullins calls attention to the fact that the Roman Catholic system is the direct antithesis to the doctrine of the soul's competency. "In every particular of the ecclesiastical and religious life of the Roman Catholic, the soul's incapacity is assumed. All the seven sacraments illustrate the statement in a striking way." As for the Protestant churches, they are inconsistent in that they try to combine the Romish principle of incompetency with the antithetic principle of competency. "In insisting upon the doctrine of justification by faith they recognize the principle of competency; but in retaining infant baptism or episcopacy they introduce the opposite view. Infant baptism takes away from the child its privilege of individual initiative in salvation, and lodges in the hands of parents or sponsors the impossible task of performing an act of religious obedience for another."

But what are "The Axioms of Religion?" Growing out of the mother principle for which Baptists have always contended, viz., the competency of the soul in religion under God, six propositions are brought forward by President Mullins as self-evident truths:

1. The theological axiom: The holy and loving God has a right to be sovereign.
2. The religious axiom: All souls have an equal right to direct access to God.
3. The ecclesiastical axiom: All believers have a right to equal privileges in the church.
4. The moral axiom: To be responsible man must be free.
5. The religio-civic axiom: A free Church in a free State.
6. The social axiom: Love your neighbor as yourself.

It may be well to let our author explain what he means by the word axiom. "In calling the above statements axioms the intelligent reader will understand that I do not employ the word in its strict mathematical sense. The truths set forth,

however, are in the moral and religious sphere what axioms are in mathematics. That is to say, when the meaning of the various terms is clearly grasped there will be no protest or objection in the reader's mind. I make bold to say that in America no member of any of those churches known as 'evangelical' will dissent from any of the principles enunciated in this list of six axioms. Indeed, it is believed that the great multitude of unbelievers—men who reject Christianity as held by the evangelical bodies, but who are theists, believers in a personal God to whom man is responsible, will also admit these axioms. I do not, of course, suppose that all Roman Catholics will yield assent to these propositions save in a most abstract and general way. Romanism forbids more. Such of them as grasp clearly the principles of Romanism will combat them just as they do the whole Protestant standpoint of the right of private judgment in religion. Romanism, against the whole modern view of man, assumes the incompetency of the soul in religion. Doubtless also those in European countries who are wedded to the theory of a union of Church and State will repudiate the religio-civic axiom. But the cases of the Romanist and of the man who favors a religious establishment may for the purpose of our discussion be treated as exceptional. On the other hand, it may be asserted freely that the religious and intellectual growth of the great Protestant world since the Reformation has been such that, with the qualifications just made, the six axioms will meet with a hearty and favorable response."

In his discussion of the various axioms of religion President Mullins holds the reader's interest to the end. In his hands the doctrine of election is no longer an arbitrary or capricious thing. "It is infinite wisdom, grace, and skill, seeking to save the world by the method which will reach the greatest number in the shortest time. This explains the fact that election is a widening process. From generation to generation the horizon broadens and increasing numbers enter the kingdom. Holiness thus vindicates itself in that God refuses to violate man's moral nature, even in order to save him; and love vindicates itself

in that the process of saving men is accelerated as much as possible at every stage."

In discussing the doctrine that all men have an equal right to direct access to God, Dr. Mullins properly devotes much space to infant baptism as a contradiction of the religious axiom. He shows the hopeless contradictions in the views of evangelical Protestant churches. In replying to the plea that infant baptism is necessary to Christian nurture, he well says: "Every parental duty in the matter of religious teaching and training is possible without the use of a rite which anticipates and forestalls personal action, robs the child of the joy of conscious obedience to Christ in his own appointed ordinance; in short, which does despite and violence to individuality and personality, the choicest gift of God to our children, and that which we should above all things protect and conserve."

Inasmuch as all men have an equal right to direct access to God, they are entitled to equal privileges in the church. In the church Christ is absolute monarch and all believers are brethren. Dr. Mullins rightly insists that there is no indirect lordship known to the New Testament. "An ecclesiastical monarchy with a human head, like the Roman Catholic Church, radically alters the very nature of Christianity. Baptist congregationailsm is the exact antithesis of the Roman hierarchy. Modified ecclesiastical monarchies, or aristocracies, or oligarchies, are less objectionable, but they, too, violate one or the other of the organic laws of the church, the direct lordship of Christ, or the equality of all believers in spiritual privilege." Dr. Mullins rightly insists that the church should be an organism rather than a mechanism. He is fully persuaded that all departures from the simple democratic church polity of New Testament times have been mistakes. He believes that a religious democracy can provide itself with adequate equipment for its spiritual tasks.

In discussing human freedom our author is quite at home in philosophy as well as in exegesis. He boldly champions the cause of freedom against materialism and undue exaltation of heredity. His description of human freedom is well worth

quoting: "Now freedom is self-determination. Of course, it does not mean that the will is without bias, or that human choices are uninfluenced by external forces or other human personalities, or by divine influences of grace. It only means that when a man acts he acts for himself. The choice is his own. He is not compelled but impelled. He is self-determined. This is the core of manhood and personality. This is the inner glory of our being. It is the one spark of fire which kindles about our humanity its unique splendor." The author regards infant baptism as an interference with the religious experience of a child: "To baptize a child in infancy is to treat it not at a free moral personality, but as a thing." Infant baptism assumes that Christ demands from the soul what the soul cannot give. For there are thousands of infants left without baptism, and when the child of the Christian parent dies without it, it leaves a heartbreak which no church has a right to inflict by such teaching."

President Mullins devotes a special chapter to Christian nurture. He shows that the Baptist view is in perfect accord with the best modern pedagogical theory; for, as he tells us, "the best pedagogy ever respects personality, seeks to call forth the latent powers of the soul, and jealously guards the nature of the child from premature forcing." "Infant baptism is like requiring the mastery of algebraic symbols before the boy has learned the multiplication table." How may we know that a child has been converted? Dr. Mullins says there are two marks of this great experience: "These two elements—the Christian motive and the Christian struggle—when they appear as permanent in the child's life, are sure indications that Christ has come into that life." Our author is an enthusiastic advocate of Christian nurture in the home. The child should be surrounded with every incentive to holy living, and be led to a complete acceptance of Jesus as Lord and Savior in early youth. "There is no higher task for angels or men than to teach a little child to pray."

President Mullins remarks that a new era in man's spiritual history began when Roger Williams founded the common-

wealth of Rhode Island. He shows that Baptists both in creed and life have been the consistent adovcates of a free church in a free state. Baptists have always stood for religious liberty and not merely religious toleration. True to their doctrine of the separation of Church and State, they today oppose the appropriation of public money for sectarian schools, and the enforced reading of the Bible in the public schools. As to the exemption of church property from taxation, the author states the argument pro and con with clearness, and remarks: "Up to the present it cannot be said that time has demonstrated the unwisdom of exempting religious property from taxation."

President Mullins holds firmly that Christian men cannot keep aloof from public questions and public service. The moral and evangelistic impulse makes the true believer an aggressive advocate of a saving gospel and of all morality and social righteousness. "The church is the dynamo whose task it is to charge all departments of life with righteousness." The advantage of a democratic church polity is that it leaves men free to cast their lives and influence into the complex and manifold affairs of the State, and in all great movements for the moral and spiritual improvement of society.

In treating of "Baptists and General Organization", Dr. Mullins shows that the voluntary principle must control, the representative principle in the strict sense being excluded by our general position. Up to this time Baptists have been wise enough to avoid the evils of delegated authority. As our author remarks, "Papal infallibility is the inevitable logic of all forms of religious authority." He deprecates the suggestion occasionally thrown out that Baptists ought to have a more centralized polity.

In discussing Christian Union President Mullins calls attention to the vantage ground held by Baptists. Our people have eschewed the tendency to incorporate new features into the simple New Testament polity, and put the emphasis in their teaching and life on the great principles which our author has stated as axioms. Real Christian union cannot be secured by

manipulation, but rather by a general acceptance of the fundamental teachings of the New Testament. "We must learn to think God's thoughts after him as revealed in Christ if we are to find the clew to unity."

In a special chapter on Institutional Christianity Dr. Mullins handles with ability the plea for "open membership". He shows how persons who advocate the admission of members into the church without baptism not only overlook the many Scriptures which show that church members in New Testament times were baptized persons, but also predicate their teaching on the false assumption that baptism as a required condition of church membership interferes in some way with Christian liberty. To discard all institutional forms, which some extremists advocate, would leave the community of believers, so to speak, gasping in a vacuum.

The address delivered at the Baptist Convention of North America, held at Jamestown, Va., May, 1907, on "The Contribution of the Baptists to American Civilization", appears almost word for word as it was delivered. The style is free and flowing, and sallies of wit and humor light up the address.

The closing chapter of the book is entitled "Baptists and World Progress." If Baptists have done so much for civilization in America, the question naturally arises: Do the axioms of religion as expounded by President Mullins contain in themselves sufficient virtue to guide the distinies of the race? Do they partake of the nature of *principia*, or first principles of advancing civilization? Our author shows how these axioms will work in the religious world, in the realm of the intellectual life, and as a social and political force in the world's progress. Dangers and difficulties described by some of the leaders of religious thought would disappear before the spread of the axiomatic principles expounded by our author. Dr. Mullins shows how the educational process of the centuries culminates in the axioms of religion. The best educational method of our time is in perfect accord with these axioms. Science and Philosophy are moving in the same direction. Moreover, the extremes of Socialism will break upon these axioms. Whatever

is good and true in this great modern movement will be found to accord with these axioms.

President Mullins is a master in clean-cut definitions and felicitious illustrations. His style is so prespicuous that it is almost impossible to misunderstand him. His spirit is irenic, but he makes no compromise with error. He is always fair to an opponent, stating his position clearly and fully. He is often eloquent, but without the slightest suspicion of an attempt to be so. He is particularly happy and gifted in the department of Apologetics. In his former work entitled "Why is Christianity True?" he made a notable contribution to the defense of our common Christianity against all forms of modern attack. In the present work he offers to his Baptist brethren throughout the world the most notable statement and defense of the foundations of their faith. The book ought to go into every Baptist home in the English-speaking world.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

VII. MISCELLANEOUS.

The Magic Wand.

By Tudor Jenks. Illustrations by John R. Neill. Henry Altemus Company, Philadelphia.

This little book contains three short stories: The Magic Wand, The Sultan's Verses and The Boy and Dragon. All will be found bright and interesting for children, and the Sultan's Verses contains a fine moral lesson. I. M. M.

The Iliad for Boys and Girls. Told from Homer in Simple Language.

By the Rev. Alfred J. Church, M. A. With twelve illustrations in color. The Macmillan Company. New York. 1907. Pages 302.

I confess that I am boy enough to have enjoyed this condensation of Homer more than the text itself. To be sure one who has read Homer before will fill in a deal here and there. But Mr. Church has preserved the spirit and power of the story with surpassing skill. The very brevity gives concentrated power. The wonderful vividness of Homer is here reproduced. It is hard to think how a boy or girl could have a better intro-

duction to the Iliad than this beautiful volume. The pictures are simply delightful. It is a part of a real education to know Homer, and this work of Mr. Church is an ideal beginning of the Homeric part of the child's training. Homer never grows old, for the elemental passions rage in the Iliad.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Good Stories from the Ladies' Home Journal.

Henry Altemus Company, Philadelphia. 1907. Illuminated boards, 50 cents. Ooze calf, boxed, $1.00.

This is a bright collection of jokes with apt illustrations. They are advertised as good for the blues, for the cure of them at any rate. Books of stories have a place for the spare moments when depressed and jaded. These are good ones, as the title says.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Beautiful Joe.

By Miss Marshall Saunders. American Baptist Publication Society. Price, $1.25. Pages 399.

All true lovers of the animal creation will welcome this new and enlarged edition of Beautiful Joe.

Five hundred thousand copies of the edition first published in 1893 have already been sold, and every reader of this beautifully tender autobiography of a dog has been made a stronger friend and a greater admirer of all dumb animals. For the story deals not only with dogs, but with animals of all classes, and the book contains many helpful suggestions as to the training and care of all manner of pets, and is in every way worthy of a still more extensive reading.

B. H. DEMENT.

Gail Weston.

By Mrs. S. R. Graham Clark. Philadelphia. American Baptist Publication Society. Pages 431.

Gail Weston is the next to the oldest of the seven children of her widowed mother. She appears in the beginning as the heroine of the story and we can but admire her courage and faith through hard struggles with poverty; her tender dealings with a mother pitiably selfish and inexecusably childish; her devotion to a brother fallen into sin, and her earnestness in winning many members of her family to the Master.

We can but lament the exposing to public gaze of such an irritable specimen of motherhood, but trust that her tribe is small and not subject to imitation. There are many happy sketches in the book that make portions of it pleasant reading.

B. H. DeMent.

The True Patrick Henry.

By George Morgan, author of John Littlejohns of J., The Irene, etc. With twenty-four illustrations. J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia. 1907. Pages 324.

This is one of the very best volumes in the "True" series. The author has taken pains to get at the original sources and has used them with great skill. The result is a very clear portrait of the "forest-born Demosthenes". Henry is a fine subject for the biographer and Mr. Morgan does not miss his opportunity. It is not possible to discuss Patrick Henry adequately without bringing before the reader the colonial civilization, politics, and religion, for he had a leading part in all the issues of his time. He was not indeed a success as a soldier in the war which his eloquence had started, but he had gifts of statesmanship which Virginia put to good use. The present volume will help to perpetuate the fame of one whose glory will not fade, so long as America lasts at any rate. Henry had great native gifts, but his cause was also great. It was not platform oratory with him, but the eloquence of a soul on fire with a living issue of transcendant interest.

A. T. Robertson.

The Position of Greek in the Theological Education of To-day.

By Prof. Samuel Dickey, M. A. 1907. Pages 45.

This is the inaugural address of Professor Dickey on his entrance upon the duties of the Chair of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in the McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago. Prof. Dickey is impressed with the decline in the number of students relatively who study Greek in the schools of the country. The same situation exists in Germany, France, and even England. Only in Cambridge and Oxford does Greek hold undisputed sway.

Prof. Dickey, while recognizing the necessity for curtailment

of the old classic curriculum in view of the wealth of modern studies, deplores the decrease in mental culture that is the result. In particular it is to be regretted that so many ministers come to the theological seminary without a knowledge of Greek. A.B. can be obtained in most colleges without Greek. The pity of it is that the modern theological seminary has to cover so much new ground as to make it very difficult to acquire Greek there. The practical side of the ministers' life receives new and proper emphasis, but this should not be at the expense of the scholarly element. We must have cultured preachers, with the emphasis on both words. A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Return of the Danaids.

By Prof. J. E. Harry, Ph. D. 1906. University of Cincinnati Press. Pages 48.

These excellent critical notes, a reprint from the Classical Journal, give a good illustration of the richness of Prof. Harry's scholarly store. The skill here shown in the criticism of the text of Prometheus is a good model for New Testament criticism. A. T. ROBERTSON.

How to Invest Your Savings.

By Isaac F. Marcosson. Reprinted from the Saturday Evening Post. Henry Altemus Company, Philadelphia. 1907. Pages 120. Price 50 cents.

This book may have some interest for preachers, provided only he has some savings to invest. But even a preacher ought to save a little--if he can. These times of high prices make a heavy problem for the man with a fixed salary.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Sterrett's Homer. Iliad, First Three Books and Selections.

Edited by J. R. S. Sterrett, Professor of Greek, Cornell University. Cloth, 8vo, 619 pages, with map and illustrations. Price, $1.60. American Book Company, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago.

This edition is complete in itself. The chapter on the dialect of Homer is sufficiently full and exhaustive to make references to current grammars unnecessary. The notes are generous throughout, and the editor has endeavored to help the student over all difficulties. The notes to Books I and II are exhaus-

tive, those on Books III are less full, while those on the selections from the remaining Books grow progressively smaller in volume, but everywhere constant reference is made to the chapter on the dialect of Homer. Translations are employed sparingly in the commentary, but all the more stress is laid upon the elucidation of all questions of human interest, and the results of archaeological research have been utilized. The edition is illustrated, chiefly from the ancient monuments. The vocabulary was made directly from the poem for this edition. It is full and complete, and contains all the forms that occur in the selections printed in the volume with the meanings peculiar and suitable to each passage. A feature of the vocabulary consists in the insertion of etymologies wherever it was possible.

It would be hard to imagine a more delightful book with which to begin Homer. In this one volume the pupil has all the real help that he needs or ought to have. Advantage is taken of the new discoveries at Mycenae and Troy in both the illustrations and notes. It is enough to make one envious to think of this splendid apparatus and to remember the old books on Homer. This excellent volume is part of a Greek Series edited by Prof. H. W. Smith, of Harvard.

A. T. Robertson.

The Discoveries in Crete and their Bearing on the History of Ancient Civilization.

By Ronald M. Burrows, Professor of Greek in University College, Cardiff, Wales. John Murray, Albemarle street, W. London, England. 1907. Pages 244. Price 5s, net.

This is a timely book even though, as Prof. Burrows says, we must wait for the exhaustive work of Mr. A. J. Evans, the famous discoverer of the Palace and Labyrinths of Minos at Knossos. But enough is already known to justify the present interpretation of the facts as far as known. Prof. Burrows has the benefit of the views of experts like Mr. J. L. Myers, of Oxford, and others, besides the valuable help of Mr. Evans himself. The subject here treated, while full of technical detail, is very interesting in its main features to the general reader of

culture. It is not possible yet to reach solid conclusions on many points, but in general it is clear that the earliest Cretan civilization was long antecedent to that of Greece, earlier even than that of Mycenae, and was parallel to that of Egypt and the Euphrates valley. It was Eastern in type and very far advanced in the arts. It is astonishing to see on the pottery a couple of thousand years before Christ costumes much like those worn by the Parisian women to-day. We must revise our ideas about early culture. We are to-day learning again some of the things that the ancients forgot. They had bull fights in Crete and that is the explanation of the Minotaus; even girls fought in the arena. Minos was not only a real king of vast wealth, but he ruled a great empire and his civilization swayed a large part of the world. Many specimens of a pictographic style of writing and a later linear script have been found, but they are not yet translated. If this new language is ever deciphered, light may be thrown on the origin of the Greek language.

But apart from speculation a great gain has been made in our knowledge of the early life of the race by the discoveries in Crete. Prof. Burrows' volume is a welcome handbook for those who do not have time to make original researches in this field. He has indeed ideas of his own also at many points that will deserve the attention of scholars.

A. T. Robertson.

Mother Goose Puzzle Pictures.

Henry Altemus Company. Philadelphia. 1907. Illuminated cover. Price, 50 cents.

Here is a new idea in the way of children's books. The familiar Mother Goose rhymes appear with a concealed picture in each group. One of the figures is hidden from view, but can be found. The little book will give pleasure.

A. T. Robertson.